

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CCXX.]

APRIL, 1824.

[Vol. XIX.

THE NONCONFORMIST. No. XXVIII.

State of Religion in Sweden. (1821.)

THE Reformation in Sweden was introduced by Gustavus Wasa. He expelled the Catholic creed, and caused the Lutheran to be adopted, as contained in the Augsburg Confession. The new system was established in spite of many discouragements and difficulties. The undissembled attachment of John the IIIrd, (the second son of Gustavus,) to the Church of Rome, and the scarcely concealed fondness of Charles the IXth for the tenets of Calvin, led to violent discussion, the result of which was, that whoever may have had the best of the arguments, the Lutheran clergy retained the trophies of victory.

In Sweden, as in every part of Catholic Europe, the exactions, the intolerance, and the licentiousness of the Romish hierarchy, had laid the foundation for momentous changes, which neither secret intrigue nor open violence could long resist. The discontent and indignation scattered over the surface of society, and existing to an extent little imagined by those who looked no deeper than that surface, became a mighty and irresistible weapon in the hands of those monarchs whose plans of policy or of personal ambition wished to throw off the intolerable burthens of Papal domination; and here, as in every case where political power can league itself with the moral sense of mankind, it becomes the most formidable of all energies. The influence of good, even when directed by those who care nothing for good in the abstract, has been always mightier in the end than any resisting power, and nations have been found but too ready to co-operate in shaking off the fetters of priestly despotism, that they might rivet on themselves those of despotic sovereignty, which are neither less heavy nor less galling.

Gustavus was a man who had more rapacity than religious zeal. The wealth of the Catholic clergy was

immensely great: in fact, various regal grants had thrown into their hands two-thirds of the lands of the whole kingdom. Their aggrandizements had diminished the possessions of the nobles, and the latter were exceedingly glad to co-operate in any measures which would serve to restore to them the property which the false devotion of their forefathers had conferred upon the Church. The time fixed on by Gustavus for introducing the change he contemplated, was peculiarly auspicious. A great number of the Episcopal sees were vacant, so that he had to attack, in most cases, rights which, not being vested in individuals, were shadowy and unrepresented. He filled the bishoprics with friends of his own, and felt that the lower orders of the clergy, more ignorant and less influential than in most other countries, were not likely to oppose his schemes with eagerness or with success. Many commotions and insurrections, however, took place at this period, and some originated in, and all were strengthened by, the discontent and alarm which the imagined attacks on religion tended to excite. These feelings were not a little administered to by the decrees which applied the church plate, and even some of the church bells, to the payment of the war debts of the state.

But there were the tithes—that system of oppression which would seem, by its harassing and short-sighted injustice, sufficient to overturn, by its own action, any power or influence depending on it for its support. They were exacted to the uttermost farthing, often claimed before the harvest; and the exaction was the more severe, as only one-third of the whole went to the priest; the rest was divided between the church and the poor. Gustavus did not relieve his people from this onerous burden; but directed that the latter two-thirds should be applied to the purposes of the state; and they form at this moment a considerable

part of the public revenue. In the provinces wrested from Denmark, two-thirds of the whole are applied to church purposes.

The Lutheran clergy also hesitated not to attempt the acquirement of the ascendancy possessed by their Catholic predecessors. In this, however, they failed. They lost also much of their power and influence by the exclusion of the bishops from the senate; and most probably it was for this reason that no youths of distinguished family took orders for some time after. It is only latterly that a few poor Counts and Barons have become clergymen.

During the really aristocratic, but falsely named popular government, which existed from 1720 to 1772, the clergy obtained a considerable accession of political influence; and Gustavus III. won them to his purposes by means of knightly decorations, and other factitious dignities. From that time they have ever attached themselves to the Court party in the meetings of the States-General, and thus have retained many prerogatives, which otherwise would have been wrested from them by the other orders.* After the Reformation, the history of the Swedish Church does not present any thing worthy remark, if we except the strange infatuation for the discovery of witches, which, in the seventeenth century, affected the whole of Europe. These beings were known in Sweden by the name of Easter-hags, from the supposition that they employed the Easter week in

visiting the infernal regions, bestriding whatever lay in their way, and particularly children. The priesthood were the first to give countenance and support to this superstition, and many women fell a sacrifice to it. But the delirium passed away; a healthier judgment prevailed; and it was then discovered to what a frightful extent private enmity had gone, in availing itself of public fanaticism for the destruction of those whose ruin it premeditated.

The custom, which prevailed in Sweden, that all sentences of death must receive the signature of the King or that of the Senate, delayed the legal proceedings—and thereby afforded time for the vehemence of passion to cool. The Swedish nation, too, is not disposed to bigotry, and is generally very favourable to toleration: * the same must, in justice, be acknowledged of most of the Swedish clergy. The reasons for these dispositions are perhaps distinct. The tolerance of the people is founded on their character. A Swede is mistrustful of all that is new; he hesitates and considers long ere he decides; he will not take for granted what he does not completely understand; and he will rather think for himself than communicate his thoughts to others: whence it happens that peasants are not unfrequently found, in the more remote tracts, who have carried into effect very difficult mechanical operations, without possessing any conception of the mathematics. The tolerance of the priesthood may, in great measure, be owing to the circumstance of its income not being in any manner affected by differences in religious opinion. The peasant is compelled to pay the clergyman the same amount, whether he frequent his church or not.

The scattered situation of the inhabitants of Sweden is also very unfavourable.

* In order to understand this, it must be remembered that, at the meeting of the States-General in Sweden, the Representatives are composed of four classes or chambers, viz. nobles, priests, burghers and peasants. Each class legislates by itself; and when a project is introduced into one of the chambers, it is communicated to the others. The agreement of three of the chambers is necessary for the final passing of a law, excepting in matters touching the constitution, when the whole four must agree ere a decision can be formed. If two chambers be of one opinion, and two of another, a jury is chosen, composed of an equal number of members of each chamber; and by the majority of their votes the question is decided. On all other occasions the chambers vote separately.

* It may be here remarked, as characteristic of the Swedish nation, that at the time the Christian religion was first preached in Sweden, and when the priests of Heathenism and Christianity were contending for superiority, the people determined, at the States-General, that the secular power should not in any way interfere in the contention, but that every one should be at liberty to profess the religion which he preferred.

ourable to the propagation of new opinions. The whole population of all the towns does not exceed 250,000 persons, Stockholm containing upwards of 70,000. Thus the few sects which have started up, have existed but a short time; and the less the government has interfered with them, the less time have they lasted. It is also very remarkable, that although the Swedes are so generally phlegmatic in disposition, they are remarkably alive to ridicule; thus the professor of a new creed which is exposed to the slightest contempt, has no chance of making proselytes. And, indeed, an instance may be adduced of a sect, which already was composed of several followers, and which was entirely destroyed by a theatrical farce.

Only two sects are known to exist in Sweden; the Swedenborgians (or the adherents of the Church of the New Jerusalem) and the Moravians or Hernhuthians. These, however, differ not materially from the High Church, and even take part in its public services and rites. The Swedenborgians have no separate church nor public meetings; there are but few of them, and they are not united by any secret agreements. The Hernhuthians have separate chapels in some of the larger towns, such as Stockholm, Gothenburg and Norköping. They are not, however, distinguished from the Lutheran Church, except that they look upon the ordinary ceremonies of worship as insufficient to their devotion. They meet two or three times in the week, and on the Sunday evening their chapel is open to all who shall please to attend it. On these occasions some person, who is separately paid, reads a short discourse; at intervals, portions of the common book of Psalms are sung; and occasionally hymns of their own are employed. Their congregations are connected with each other, and their present patron or bishop is said to be the Counsellor of State, Count Rosenblad, although he does not publicly acknowledge this to be the case.

The number of these Dissenters amounts to several thousands. They are in general very industrious and laborious; but they seldom possess superior or intellectual minds. It is asserted, that they consider themselves

as exclusively *elect*, and all others rejected: they do not, however, in society evince any intolerance; indeed, the dread of public opinion would prevent their doing so.

Although the toleration of opinion was great, the liberty of the press was very much restricted, until the year 1809; every writing of a theological nature being submitted to the superintendence and censure of the Consistorial Courts.* By the constitution of 1809, all censorship was abolished, and the publication of opinions permitted.

This toleration had but a short existence; and it was not long ere doctrines themselves were scrutinized. At the meeting of the States-General in 1812, at Örebro, the liberty of the press was in a great measure destroyed. The Consistorial Courts even entertained the idea of preventing the publication of religious opinions altogether. This meditated intolerance was defeated by its being ordained in 1815, that a jury should decide in all cases touching the liberty of the press; for in consequence of this proceeding, every prosecution for publications denounced by the Consistorial Courts was dismissed. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged that, with the exception of one pamphlet in defence of Predestination, no work has appeared which has not stated its opinions with moderation and candour.

The Sunday is certainly not so strictly observed in Sweden as in England; but public worship is every where well attended, provided the priest possess but a moderate portion of talent. Religion is so generally held in veneration, that no individual dare offend against it: public opinion in such a case needs not the assistance of the law. But it must be remembered that, in Sweden, the word religion embraces only the principal truths of Christianity, and not the doctrines of any particular sect: even to the latter a respect is paid by all

* In every bishopric there is a Consistorial Court, the bishop acting as president, and, in case of his absence, the dean. There are also Consistorial Courts at Stockholm and Carlsrona. These courts have the management of church regulations and of the public schools.

educated men, which prevents their ridiculing them, at all events, in the presence of those who profess them. The season of Christmas is held particularly sacred: this may, probably, be owing to the circumstance of there having been a solemn feast held at this time of the year, long ere the Christian religion was introduced. During Lent, the church organs are not used, (excepting on the day of the annunciation of the Virgin Mary,) and in some places the altar, communion-table and pulpit, are covered with black cloth.

There are but few Catholics in Sweden: the greatest number reside in Stockholm, where they have a church and priest; they consist principally of artisans, manufacturers and labourers, and scarcely amount to one thousand persons, including women and children. A few Russians, who reside in Stockholm, have a church there, and the Reformers have two. From all that has been said, it may be perceived that Sweden offers no encouragement to friars or Jesuits; she cannot be disturbed by them, even though no prohibition exist against their admission.

The clergy in Sweden are better paid than public officers, civil or military. There are some rectors who possess larger incomes than the ministers of state. The archbishop receives yearly the value of at least 2000 Swedish barrels of grain, which contain about 8000 bushels. The Bishops of Linköping and Westeros receive about 1500 barrels (6000 bushels).

The Universities are constituted principally for the formation of priests. They retain nearly all their ancient forms. Instruction in the art of preaching is afforded, but none in political economy, none in statistics, none upon the constitution of the country. The public institutions are generally under the controul of the priesthood; for although it is not necessary that the instructors at the universities, colleges and schools, should be priests, most of them take orders, in order that they may obtain a benefice in addition to their situation of tutor. In most towns there are public schools, where the instructors are paid by the state. At these

places, little else is taught besides the doctrines of Christianity, and Latin. At the principal ones, they commence the study of Greek. From these places the student is sent to one of the colleges, which exist in every diocese except Scania. Here he is instructed by six lecturers; two reading upon theology, and the remainder upon logic, German, history, morals, mathematics, Latin and Greek. Upon his arrival at the university, he goes through a course of theological examinations. He is then at liberty to select what study he pleases, and generally to read as much or as little as he may think proper. In order, however, to obtain a testimony of the time he has remained at the university, he must submit to an examination in such sciences as he may have applied himself to.

There are two universities in Sweden—Upsala and Lund. The instructors are called professors, and are liberally paid by the State. Their income is not affected by the number of students they may have to instruct, their salary being a fixed amount. They devote certain appointed hours of the day to teaching that science which forms their branch of instruction, and afford particular instruction to such students as may require their services. Each university has a protector, who is denominated a Chancellor, and who watches over its interests. The Crown Prince is at present the Chancellor of Upsala, and Count Von Engeström, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, is the Chancellor of Lund. The Archbishop of Upsala and the Bishop of Lund are entrusted with the duties of a narrow inspection of the universities, and are called Vice-Chancellors. Besides these, there is an annual election of a chief from among the professors, who superintends the academical regulations, and possesses the title of *Rector Magnificus*.

The annual number of students at Upsala is about 800, and at Lund about 500. They divide themselves according to the province in which they were born, calling themselves nations. A species of council, named *Consistorium Academicum*, consisting of the professors, has the care of the economy of the University, and pos-

sesses the power of pronouncing sentence in cases where the students have been guilty of any misbehaviour, but has no power over more serious offences.

All matters touching religion, the public means of instruction, and the sciences are submitted to the King by the Secretary of State for Ecclesiastical Matters. The latter possesses no power whatever.

Sweden, as far as relates to the Church, is divided into 12 dioceses, 172 prebsteries or dignitaries, 1223 rectories, 2400 parishes or congregations, containing as many churches, and 45 chapels.*

The dioceses are,

The Arch-Diocese of Upsala, which includes the counties of Uplandia and Gefleborg, with a part of Westmanlandia; forming in extent 294 Swedish square miles,† and containing 244 churches.

The Diocese of Linköping, which consists of nearly all Ostrogothia, and part of Imolandia, is in extent 183 Swedish square miles, and the number of its churches is 215.

The Diocese of Skara, which includes the greater part of Westrogothia, a district of Smolandia, and a parish of Wermlandia, and contains 363 churches, on an extent of 116 Swedish square miles.

The Diocese of Strengnäs, which includes all Sodermania, the Southern part of Nerikæ, a rectory of Westmanlandia, and another of Ostrogothia: it possesses 159 churches, and extends 121 Swedish square miles.

The Diocese of Westeros, which includes Dalekarlia, the greater part of Westmanlandia, and one half of Nerikæ, and possesses 127 churches, on an extent of 381 Swedish square miles.

The Diocese of Wexiæ, which includes the greater portion of Smolandia, and possesses 186 churches, on an extent of 176 Swedish square miles.

* These chapels are small churches, which are chiefly situated upon small islands among the out rocks. They generally have separate clergymen, although they do not form different parishes.

† A Swedish square mile is $44\frac{1}{5}$ English square miles, or 1,082,410,000 Parisian feet.

The Diocese of Lund, which consists of Scania and Blekingæ, and contains 427 churches, on an extent of 118 Swedish square miles.

The Diocese of Gothenburg, which contains the counties of Bohus and Hallandia, with the Western part of Westrogothia, and possesses 259 churches, on an extent of 137 Swedish square miles.

The Diocese of Calmar, which consists of a small part of Smolandia and the isle of Öland, and contains 62 churches in the space of 64 Swedish square miles.

The Diocese of Carlstad, which contains Wermlandia, with the exception of one parish, Dalslandia, and part of the mine-country, called Bergslangen, in the county of Nerikæ. It possesses 130 churches, on 192 Swedish square miles.

The Diocese of Hernosand, which contains the most Northerly parts of the provinces of Sweden: its extent is no less than 2062 Swedish square miles, and it contains 136 churches.

The Diocese of Wisby, which consists of the island of Gothland, and possesses 92 churches, on an extent of 27 Swedish square miles.

The Archbishop is the most distinguished of the prelates, but he possesses no authority over them. At the meeting of the States-General, he is the representative or spokesman of the clergy.

Each bishop superintends, in his own diocese, all that relates to the affairs of the church and the means of instruction. He is assisted by his Consistorial Court, and by them his power is limited, as all decisions are formed upon a plurality of votes.

When a clergyman is arraigned for any offence connected with his office, the Consistorial Court has the power of examining the case and of dismissing the offender, if the fault be of so serious a nature as to require such a course.

The Bishop ordains all who take orders, and installs the rectors. It is also incumbent on him to travel throughout his diocese, in order that he may see in what manner the priesthood perform their duties, and inquire into the state of religious instruction afforded to the community. His office does not oblige him to preach.

Every district or parish has its church; but a rectory generally contains several districts, sometimes six or seven. The rector, who has the care of these congregations, is appointed, in some cases, by the King, and, in others, by the Consistorial Court. In the latter instance the Court decides upon three candidates, and the parish has the right of electing the one whom they may think proper. The Lord of the Manor sometimes possesses the privilege of electing the rector. This privilege is called *Jus Patronatus*.*

In most places the rector has curates and chaplains to assist him. These are always appointed and paid by the parish. The rector is also allowed a separate assistant, who is called an adjunct, when he arrives at a certain age, or possesses many occupations. The rector himself pays this assistant.

A contract or prewstery consists of six, ten, and sometimes fourteen rectories, and one of the rectors is called the Contract-Prewst. In other cases the title of Prewst is conferred by the bishop upon any rector whom he may please to select.

If a rector die after the 1st of May, his widow or heirs are entitled to the profits of the rectory until the 1st of May next ensuing. If he leave a widow, or children under age, they receive, besides the above, an amount equal to one year's profits, and if he die poor, to an amount equal to two years' profits. These are called single and double years of grace. In some dioceses there are founded widow-seats or habitations, the product of which the rector's widow collects while she remains unmarried.

On the appointment of a bishop, each rector gives a vote to three individuals: these are not of necessity clergymen. The votes having been collected, three names which possess the greater number of votes are submitted to the King, who has the power of appointing the one whom he shall please, to the office of bishop.

The Doctors of Theology are appointed by the King.

The Rectors of Cathedrals are called Doom-Prewsts or Deans, and reside

* Some few parishes also possess the *Jus Patronatus*.

in all towns where there are bishops. They are elected in the same manner as the other rectors.

The Church ceremonies are more solemnly performed than those of the Reformed Churches, particularly on grand festivals. The use of candles upon the communion-table and the pulpit at Christmas, is, however, owing to there being so little day-light at the time of these holidays, as to be often insufficient for the performance of public worship. In addition to this, on Christmas-day early matins are held, when it is absolutely necessary that the churches should be lighted. In most towns matins are very frequently performed, and in the larger ones, on every Sabbath, there are Even-songs. In the country, where the number of churches often exceeds that of the clergymen in each rectory, but one sermon is preached, except on Christmas-day; and, in many places, public worship is performed in rotation in the different churches of the rectory, one of them being always without service. In the Western parts of Sweden, the clergyman is sometimes obliged to perform duty in one church, and afterwards to travel eight or ten English miles to preach in another. There are some churches in which service is performed but a few times in the course of the year.

There formerly existed throughout Sweden a custom, which still prevails in some parts of the country, which is this: the beadle walks up and down the aisles during sermon-time, holding in his hand a rod, and if he find any individual napping, he strikes the floor with his staff; if this do not succeed in awakening the sleeper, he is at liberty to rouse him by applying his rod to the shoulder of the offender. Another custom, which, however, is discontinued in the larger towns, is that of collecting money during the sermon, in a bag affixed to the end of a long stick, which is often furnished with bells. Of the money thus collected part is applied to the uses of the church, part is given to the priest, and part is devoted to charitable purposes within the parish. For the same object, plates are deposited at the church doors, in the towns, after sermon-time, into which individuals may drop their donations.

Sunday is generally selected by the peasantry for the burial of the dead, the baptism of their children, and for the solemnization of marriage. The last is attended by several ceremonies of different descriptions, according to the difference of customs in each province: these are increased if the bride and bridegroom possess much property. For the purpose of baptism, children are generally brought to church ere they are eight days old: they are sometimes taken to the house of the clergyman: in the latter case, the priest desires that some of the individuals of his house become sponsors. The godfather and godmother, at the baptismal ceremony, take upon themselves the responsibility of teaching the child the grounds of Christianity, if its parents shall die during its tender years; but this is done conditionally, that is to say, as far as circumstances shall admit of their fulfilling this duty; and they possess no authority over the child.

In the country, instruction is afforded partly by the clerk of the parish, and partly in separate schools. In many places schools have been erected by private individuals, who have bestowed a piece of ground for the purpose. Other individuals have given an annual stipend to the schoolmaster. In some instances the congregation has taken this affair upon themselves. The government interferes but little in this branch of instruction: nevertheless, at the present moment there is scarcely any person in Sweden of a mature age who does not know how to read, and by far the greater part are able to write.

The Lancasterian plan of tuition has lately been practised in Stockholm and a few other towns.

In the towns, any child may be sent free of expense to the public institutions, as the tutors are paid by the state, though not generally in a handsome manner. In some places they receive a compensation for their low salary in the following manner: every year which they have passed in the performance of duty in the schools is considered as equivalent to two years passed in the exercise of any other official capacity; and this computation has great advantages when they stand as candidates for a living, as those

who have served for the greater number of years are always entitled to a preference.

A new translation of the Bible has been proposed in Sweden for upwards of fifty years; but not one has been produced, which has afforded satisfaction to the clergy. Particular parts of both the Old and New Testaments have, however, been translated with great ability, especially the Psalms of David, the book of Job, and the principal parts of the Prophets, by Tingstadius, Bishop of Strengnäs. During the last year a new-modelled book of Psalms was published, which will, in all probability, ere the close of this, be generally made use of in all churches. Dr. Wallin has had the principal management of the publication, and is also the author of the greatest as well as the finest part of the new Psalms. As many of the old ones as could well be retained, have been preserved in this collection. Through the instrumentality of the late Archbishop Lindblom, a new book of Common Prayer and Liturgy has been adopted. It does not contain, however, any alteration in the church ceremonies, except that the exorcism and the crossing at the administration of baptism are discontinued. The customary church prayers have been corrected and altered, although not in every instance, to the improvement of their expression. Lindblom likewise remodelled, and caused to be adopted in the schools, the catechism of Luther, to which was annexed, the explanation of Bishop Swebelius. This catechism contains several of the superstitious doctrines of the 16th century, which are not suited to the more enlightened opinions of the present age. The alterations effected by the Archbishop Lindblom often evince a want of clear judgment, and have not that consistency which the old regulations possessed. A new arrangement of the Epistles and Gospels is expected.*

* In Sweden, the clergyman does not select his own text for his sermon. The texts are appointed for every Sunday and holiday throughout the year, and are collected in what are called books of Evangelists, from their containing, in every text, a longer or shorter extract from the writings of the Evangelists. At

Among religious associations, those called the Bible Societies are most worthy of remark. These exist in several towns, and hold correspondence with each other. Their object is partly to distribute Bibles gratis, and partly to furnish them at a cheap rate. A society, calling themselves the Evangelical Society, and whose President is the Counsellor of State, Count Rosenblad, consists solely of Hernbuthians; they print and distribute religious tracts, which principally contain relations of the conversion or death of some individual. Another society, which has adopted the motto of "*Pro Fide et Christianismo*," is of more ancient foundation; it has published divers writings, which bear no mark of any Dissenting principles.

In Sweden there are no religious periodical publications deserving notice. One of them, styled "*Accounts of the Progress of the Gospel*," is of Hernbuthian principles, and is but little read. A journal, called "*The Swedish Congregational Paper*," was commenced this year, and contains matter relative to the history of the Swedish Church, biographies not very often connected with the same, and some criticisms, which are more elaborate than interesting. In each diocese there is published what is called the Diocesan newspaper; but it relates little else besides clerical preferments and deaths, statements of vacant rectories, and ordinances relative to the clergy. Occasionally there are, likewise, short biographical notices of deceased ministers.

There are more works upon theology published in Sweden yearly, than upon any other subjects; these consist principally of sermons, which are sometimes formed into collections, with an appropriate sermon for each Sunday and holiday throughout the year. These collections, or family sermon-books (called in Sweden Pos-

the commencement of each Gospel a short prayer is to be found, called the Collect: then follows an extract from the writings of the Apostles, called the Epistle; and after the Gospel is another prayer. At Even-song the sermons are founded upon the Epistle; and at Matins the priests are allowed to select their own text, Christmas-day excepted, when there are two Gospels appointed.

tills), are to be met with in most houses, and are particularly employed in the country, where the distance from Church renders it oftentimes difficult to proceed thither. It is not unusual to find the whole household engaged in family prayers, the sermon being read by the master of the house. Formerly it was customary for the distinguished families to keep chaplains.

B.

Testimony to Christianity from Lord Byron.

WE seldom introduce the name of Lord Byron into the Monthly Repository. We dare not express admiration, and we are unwilling to join the ranks of those that, from such different motives, raise their voices against him. He is now employed in a good work, the assistance of the Greeks, and happy shall we be to see that in this philanthropic service he is making amends to mankind for any injury which he may have done to society by his writings.

A passage in one of his latest poems, with a curious note upon it, has led to the introduction of his name upon the present occasion. The passage, and still more the note, is ambiguous: we are eager to find in it some glimmering of returning piety, but the flash of light in the text is succeeded by thick darkness in the note. The lines are as follows:

Experience is the chief philosopher,
But saddest when his science is well
known:
And persecuted sages teach the schools
Their folly in forgetting there are fools.
Was it not so, great Locke? and greater
Bacon?
Great Socrates? And thou Diviner still,
Whose lot it is by man to be mistaken,
And thy pure creed made sanction of
all ill?
Redeeming worlds to be by bigots shaken,
How was thy toil rewarded? We
might fill
Volumes with similar sad illustrations,
But leave them to the conscience of the
nations.

On the words "*Diviner still*," the Noble author has the following comment:

"As it is necessary in these times to avoid ambiguity, I say, that I mean, by "*Diviner still*," CHRIST. If ever

God was man—or man God—he was *both*. I never arraigned his creed, but the use—or abuse—made of it. Mr. Canning one day quoted Christianity to sanction Negro Slavery, and Mr. Wilberforce had little to say in reply. And was Christ crucified, that black men might be scourged? If so, he had better been born a Mulatto, to give both colours an equal chance of freedom, or at least salvation.”

The belief of a God-man or Man-god is here put upon a condition which renders it nugatory. “Your *if* is a great peacemaker” to conscience.

Of the debate between Mr. Canning and Mr. Wilberforce we have no recollection; and we doubt the correctness of the statement that the former gentleman “quoted Christianity to sanction Negro Slavery.” But suppose that he did, and that others admit his authority, it would not follow that any Christians believe that Christ was crucified *that black men might be scourged*! Here is, in fact, a complete non sequitur. The confusion of ideas is palpable. His Lordship’s rhodomontade seems to have been designed to bring in the poor joke in the last sentence, which means nothing, and is only a proof of the writer’s propensity to slide back to old habits.

We accept, however, from Lord Byron, a testimony, at least disinterested, to the “pure creed,” “Divine” character and exalted merits of our Lord. He “never,” he declares, “arraigned his creed, but the use or abuse made of it.” This disavowal of hostility to the Christian religion is so far good as it stops the mouths of smaller wits, who, under sanction of Lord Byron’s name, have thrown out jests and sarcasms against Christianity, and supposed them to be arguments. May it not be further, a promise of “good things to come”? May we not hope, that as this keen-eyed man begins to distinguish between the use and the abuse of Christianity, he may in the end be convinced of the truth and excellence of the gospel, and receive the consolation which his anxious mind is looking for, in the belief and profession of the pure doctrine of Jesus, and become, in a higher sense than he has yet been, the admiration and ornament of his species?

Bristol,

February 4, 1824.

SIR,

ALLOW me, through the medium of your valuable Miscellany, to lay before the Unitarian public a few observations on a subject which I could wish had found, what it justly merits, an equally able, as it has in me a zealous advocate.

It is that of Sunday-Schools.

As I am always solicitous to submit my sentiments with diffidence, I shall beg to offer them in the phraseology of inquiry: first adverting to the cause which actuated their forthcoming.

It is a fact, a lamentable fact, and to me no less a matter of regret than it is of surprise, that among Unitarian Christians there are to be found those, and I fear many, who, if not averse, are manifestly indifferent to the teaching of the poor, in other words, to Sunday-Schools.

We are apt, and I allow with a degree of propriety, to expatiate on the palpable inconsistency which pervades the opinions and practice of modern orthodoxy. We are apt to indulge the smile of sarcasm, and the tear of pity, at the absurdity of the means, and the enthusiasm of the manner, employed to propagate those opinions—opinions which we cannot but deem the mere offspring of deep-rooted prejudice, of a wild imagination, or of a tortured and debilitated judgment.

But, Sir, is there not too much room for a retort, though not to be identified in species, yet in character no less reprehensible; when the Unitarian is heard to condemn, as prejudice or dissimulation, the credenda of all who embrace it, not from conviction, and yet at the same time himself withhold the means, and those the only means, by which that is to be accomplished—the means of instruction?

Here, however, I would remark, that it is not a Unitarian education which I mean; that would be defeating the very end in view. It has ever been my most scrupulous regard to avoid the least inculcation of any system of religion. For is it not as unreasonable to expect a conscientious, unprejudiced Unitarian, after an education in that doctrine, as it is to look for it in the man whose ignorance renders him incapable to judge for himself? Hence

we have two evils to avoid, both alike pernicious and deserving our particular attention:—the one, a *total neglect of any kind of education*;—the other, an *education in the doctrines of a particular system of religion*.

But to proceed. How is it, I would ask, that so few of our magnificent and spacious places of worship can boast of having spacious school-rooms appended to them? How is it that our public donation lists teem with items in favour of ministers and chapels, and almost every other praiseworthy object, and not a solitary one applicable to that of Sunday-Schools?

Does not this seem to indicate that the Unitarian grants, tacitly at least, to his Trinitarian brethren the pre-occupation of the vulgar minds of the lower classes of society to implant and cherish those very stamina which constitute his chief complaint, whose eradication is his greatest difficulty? Or that he permits the most vigorous portion of their existence to run out in the debasing, unregenerative torpor of "blessed ignorance," until they are incapacitated for the reception of any thing opposed to that prevalent but pseudo-proverb, "*Vox populi vox Dei*"?

And is not the large expenditure in the erection of chapels, and the education and support of ministers, like the providing of hospitals and physicians for the cure of a malady which timely exertions might have prevented?

Far be it from me, however, to depreciate the value or the respect of the ministerial office. But let not the din of surprise, at the tardy progress of Unitarian Christianity, which I firmly believe to be genuine Christianity, be re-echoed in our ears, whilst we are furnished with so obvious a solution of its cause.

Does not, I repeat it, the existence of the above fact, viz., that of negligence in the education, and in the purity of the education, of the youthful poor, taken in connexion with the requirement of candour in a man's sentiments, manifest a discrepancy which no argument can reconcile, no doctrine justify, no liberality conceal?

Cannot we here also trace a foundation; and is it not to be feared that, in some sense and to a certain extent, a too solid foundation, for that odium

which is so industriously levelled against Unitarians, that theirs is not the religion of those to whom the gospel is proclaimed to be peculiarly adapted, "the poor of this world"?

Before I take my leave, I beg to propose to my fellow-worshippers, and I could wish, fellow-workers, this simple question,—*On what principle of reasoning, and from what motives can a Unitarian maintain an indifference to the education of the youthful poor?*

Having trespassed so much on your columns, I would, in conclusion, express my earnest wish of soon finding the subject in better hands, believing it to be alike the cause of humanity, of religion and of God.

With an acknowledgment of my obligations for your kind accommodation, believe me, Sir, to be a friend to Unitarianism, and THEREFORE,

A FRIEND TO SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

P. S. To obviate any misconception of the above remarks, I beg they may be taken with some limitation. There are, I am happy to admit, exceptions to their general application. And I cannot but name an honourable and exemplary one—BIRMINGHAM.

Necessity of an Improved Version of the Scriptures: a Vindication of Sir J. B. Burges and Mr. Bellamy from the Censures of Mr. Horne.

SIR,

I AM disposed to consider your valuable Miscellany as a kind of neutral ground, on which contending parties may meet with less restraint to adjust their differences, than they can be expected to do in any place assigned for conference within their own respective territories; and this reflexion, added to a very natural dislike of agitating questions in the midst of those who have for a long period ranged themselves on one particular side, determined to concede nothing, and even inclined to look upon a discussion as invidious and hostile, which may lead to a mere examination of the tenability of the post which they have assumed, has induced me to trouble you on the present occasion:

at the same time I deem it necessary to premise, that as my main object is to point out what appears to me to be a grave mistake on the part of a certain writer, I shall endeavour, as much as possible, to avoid falling into a similar one myself, and, in particular, be as guarded in expression as circumstances will permit.

I was much grieved a year or two ago on reading the second volume of Mr. Horne's "Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures," to find, at pp. 259—264, an attack on two gentlemen who have greatly interested themselves in promoting a new translation of the Holy Bible, (the one, by actually commencing a new version himself, the other by urging the advantage and necessity of such a work being undertaken,) in which assertions are imputed to both, which, if actually used by them, would not only prove them to be in the main extremely ignorant indeed, but, what is worse, decided enemies also to the best interests of both Church and State. That I may not be guilty of any misstatement, I shall beg leave to transcribe the principal passage in which the attack here alluded to is made:

"Upwards of two centuries have elapsed since the authorized English Version of the Holy Scriptures, now in use, was given to the British nation. During that long interval, though many passages in particular books have been elucidated by learned men, with equal felicity and ability; yet its *general* fidelity, perspicuity and excellence, have deservedly given our present translation a high and distinguished place in the judgment of the Christian world, wherever the English language is known or read. Of late years, however, this admirable Version, the guide and solace of the sincere Christian, has been attacked with no common virulence, and arraigned as being deficient in fidelity, perspicuity and elegance; ambiguous and incorrect, even in matters of the highest importance; and, in short, *totally insufficient for teaching all things necessary to salvation*. The principal antagonists of this Version, in the present day, (to omit the bold and unmeasured assertions of the late Dr. Geddes and others,) are Mr. John Bellamy, in the prospectus, preface and notes of

his new translation of the Bible, and Sir James Bland Burges, in his 'Reasons in Favour of a New Translation of the Scriptures;' both of whom, among other things, have affirmed that our authorized translation is *insufficient for teaching all things necessary to salvation*; and they declare that it is *not* made from the original Hebrew, but from the Septuagint or Greek translation, and from the Vulgate or Latin Version. The assertions of these authors have been answered in detail, particularly by the Rev. Messrs. Whittaker and Todd, in their works cited below, to which the reader is referred. In refutation of the assertion that our version was not made from the original Hebrew and Greek, it is sufficient to refer to the account given of it in the preceding pages; we shall therefore conclude our notice of this admirable translation with a few of the very numerous testimonies to its value, which have been collected by Archbishop Newcome and Mr. Todd, and shall subjoin two or three others that appear to have eluded their researches."

Mr. Horne follows this up by quotations from the works of eleven writers, some of whom speak in favour of the fidelity of the authorized Version, and others in praise of the style in which it is drawn up; but as I may have an opportunity of adverting to them hereafter, it is unnecessary to dwell further on them at present.

The extraordinary expressions here put into the mouth of Mr. Bellamy and Sir J. Bland Burges, the latter of whom has been long known to the public as an elegant and, I may add, pious writer, and who, as may be remembered, was for a considerable period connected with one of the chief departments of the government of this country, staggered my belief of the actual fact, and naturally created in me a wish to satisfy myself by ocular demonstration, whether either or both of these gentlemen had any where incautiously asserted in the phraseology of Mr. Horne, (twice repeated,) that the present authorized English Version of the Holy Scriptures is *totally insufficient for teaching all things necessary to salvation*, or whether the Reverend Author of the Introduction had not, on the other hand, been mistaken in ascribing to them

expressions which they never used, and which were no where to be found in their writings.

As Mr. Horne has limited himself in his charge against Mr. Bellamy to the prospectus, preface and notes of his New Translation of the Bible, I might have been also fairly excused from reading any more of that gentleman's works, to satisfy my mind on the object of the present inquiry; but the interesting subjects which he has discussed, the new lights which he has thrown on many perplexed passages, and even doubtful occurrences in Holy Writ; joined to a natural curiosity to see in what manner he answered those opponents, of whom Mr. Horne has obligingly given a list in his work, led me further than I intended at first to go; so that, beginning with his Bible, I have carefully perused whatever has hitherto issued from his pen; not forgetting, at the same time, the writings of his adversaries. Mr. Bellamy's "Translation of the Bible, from the original Hebrew only," of which no more than the Pentateuch has as yet been published, is undoubtedly his principal work, to which, in fact, all his other writings, as his "History of all Religions," his "Ophion," occasional "Biblical Criticisms" in the Classical Journal, and, though last, not least, his "Anti-Deist," are respectively subservient. I have read and re-read his new translation of the five books of Moses, with its Preface, Introduction and Notes, as well as the prospectus issued previous to their publication, and although, individually, I could have wished that in many cases he had been somewhat more courteous to the translators of our present authorized Version, yet considering the immense and novel mass of biblical information which he has brought forward, the intimate acquaintance which he displays with the original Hebrew, unshackled by the opinions of preceding translators, commentators, or even grammarians, and the clear and distinct views which his writings unfold of the communications of Jehovah to man, and of his dealings with his people of old, as deduced from the sacred original, (being in the strictest accordance, unless I am miserably deceived, with the sentiments of the best and most learned divines of the Church of En-

gland,) I, for one, at least, feel well inclined to excuse a lack of compliment. Although now become a warm admirer of Mr. Bellamy's new translation, on the grounds just mentioned, which lead me to predict that it will sooner or later maintain a distinguished post in the library of every sound divine and critical Hebrew scholar in this country, (even as the late lamented Dr. Edward Clarke, of Cambridge, was heard to say, that during his life-time he assigned it a prominent place in the University Library,) yet, as an impartial examiner, I owe it as a duty both to him and the readers of Mr. Horne's "Introduction" to declare, that, neither in the prospectus and preface, nor in the notes to Mr. Bellamy's New Translation of the Bible, have I found any expression which could be tortured, unless by the grossest and most wilful perversion, into an assertion that *the present authorized English Version of the Holy Scriptures is totally insufficient for teaching all things necessary to salvation*. Perhaps, however, mere negative proofs may not be sufficient for your readers, and hence I shall endeavour to shew, by a quotation from Mr. Bellamy's "History of all Religions," which, though published prior to his new translation, is yet frequently quoted and confirmed in the latter, that his opinion of the present authorized Version, with all its errors and mistakes, is, that it is *decidedly sufficient for teaching all things necessary to salvation*. Under the head of "The Christian Religion," p. 167, 2d ed., Mr. Bellamy says, and it must be remembered that the texts quoted or alluded to by him, are taken from our present authorized English Version,

"We now come to treat of those things sacred to every Christian, when, to fulfil the ancient promise, that *the seed of the woman should bruise the Serpent's head*, Messiah, the Redeemer of the world, left the glory of the Father, *which he had with him before the world was*, became man for our salvation (at whose coming the sacrifices appointed to be observed under the Mosaic dispensation were to cease for ever), and promulgated the truths of our holy religion.

"The fundamental principles of the Christian religion appear from what

is said by our Lord and his disciples to consist in REPENTANCE, FAITH, and UPRIGHTNESS OF LIFE; LOVE TO GOD and CHARITY TO MAN. Here is the groundwork on which the spiritual temple is to be raised for the reception of heaven in man; *ye are the temple of God*. 'REPENTANCE' whereby we forsake sin, and FAITH whereby we steadfastly believe the promises of God, which, if it be a genuine faith, will produce a life in conformity thereto, *a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man*.

"Unlike all the churches which preceded, the Christian church was not to be a representative church; no types, no figures were necessary, when the great founder of our religion made his appearance. He came to abolish the sacrifices and ceremonies of the Jews, which were all representative of him the GREAT SACRIFICE; and to shew man that the sacrifice of a contrite and broken spirit, operating in a life agreeably to the commands of God, is the most acceptable sacrifice to him. *Whereewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings and calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams? or with ten thousand rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O Man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?* This is summed up in those ever-memorable words of the Christian Redeemer, which comprehend the substance of true religion: Matt. xxii. 37, 39: '*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*'"

If the reader is not contented herewith, let him further turn to Mr. Bellamy's short but able answer to Levi in proof of Christ being the true Messiah, pp. 323—367, of the same work, which is only an echo to the sentiments perpetually recurring in the notes to his new translation.

Having thus stated the reasons which lead me to conclude that Mr.

Horne laboured under a heavy mistake when imputing to Mr. John Bellamy the obnoxious assertion above alluded to, I might pass on to the consideration of his worthy coadjutor the Baronet, did I not conceive that having once introduced Mr. Bellamy so pointedly to your readers, a brief emuneration of his controversial tracts might not be unacceptable here. If I am not in error (and more than one of your correspondents can set me to rights if I be), Mr. Bellamy's first polemical writing of any note (independent of his criticisms in the Classical Journal) consisted of letters under the signature of "Biblicus," addressed in conjunction with those of *Vindex* and *Candidus*, to the Rev. G. D'Oyly, then Christian Advocate of Cambridge, in answer to his second attack on the *Œdipus Judaicus* of Sir William Drummond, who, himself, furnished a preface thereto, which exhibits one of the happiest specimens of irony extant in the English language. After an interval of several years, during which the first and second part of his translation appeared, we find him again entering the arena with his old antagonist, whose articles in the Quarterly Review were severally met by a first and second "Reply." To these succeeded his "Critical Examination" of the objections made to his translation by Mr. Todd, in the "Vindication of our Authorized Version," &c., and by Mr. Whittaker, in his "Historical and Critical Enquiry into the Interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures," &c.; and lastly, "A Reply to Mr. S. Lee, Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge," in answer to his "Remarks," &c., in which also he notices the *Vindiciæ Hebraicæ* of Mr. Heyman Hurwitz. Having already expressed myself favourable to Mr. Bellamy's new translation, it can hardly be supposed that I should feel inclined to find fault with any attempts made by him to defend the same; in fact, a careful perusal of his opponent's works in connexion with his replies, has only tended to increase my opinion of his merits; nor shall I pretend to conceal the truth that for more reasons than one I could have wished, if it were once for all deemed necessary to impugn the new translation, that the task of combating it had been

entrusted to critics of a very different stamp than those who have figured away on the occasion, but whose writings cannot for a moment be allowed to possess any weight either with the Hebrew scholar or the mere logician. Where, during the warfare carried on, may I ask, was the Bishop of Peterborough? Was he asleep at his post, or only cautiously waiting the result of the fray? Was the Bishop of St. David's tired at the very outset; or, is his silence the result of conviction? Will no one take up the gauntlet which Bellamy has publicly thrown down, and translate and apply the various passages of Scripture propounded at different times in his pamphlets; or, has Bellamy's answer to Professor Lee silenced not only him but all the Doctors of both Universities? I ask not these questions in a tone of taunting or reproach, but rather of surprise; my object, I trust, is the acquirement of truth, and sorry should I be, indeed, if I were so bigoted to any one system, or to the translation of any one particular author, as to be unable to give it up, on arguments being adduced sufficient to convince me of the superiority and greater truth of another: but, if after a patient reading of the new translation with an application of such a knowledge of the original Hebrew as I happen to possess, I find on a comparison instituted between it and our present authorized Version, that the former, at least in my humble opinion, deserves the preference, as having elucidated much hitherto left uncertain, doubtful, and even contradictory in the latter, something more is surely requisite to cause a change in my opinion than a pamphlet or two replete with invective and sarcasm, but mainly deficient in sound argument and a critical knowledge of Hebrew. The last separate work which has come from Mr. Bellamy's pen, is, I believe, the "Anti-Deist," in two parts, the third not having yet been published. According to his own account, it was written at a period when the country was inundated with Infidel and Deistical publications, and was intended to be a complete refutation of them. There is a curious circumstance connected with this work, to which Mr. B. has alluded in one of his pamphlets, where he states that

he was induced to write it, at the suggestion of a worthy prelate of the Establishment, who afterwards saw and approved of the MS. How a Bishop could well countenance a work which pretends to answer the objections of Deists, by shewing, in many instances, that the grounds of their cavil are not to be found in the original, but only exist in the modern translations of the Bible, and consequently in our authorized Version among the rest, appears somewhat extraordinary, and can, perhaps, only be satisfactorily accounted for, by supposing that it was the same prelate, who, on another occasion, when B. presented him with a part of his translation, emphatically exclaimed to those present "*magna est veritas et prævalebunt*!" Be that, however, as it may, certain it is, (as may be gathered from the newspapers of the time,) that an association was actually formed towards the close of the year 1819, for the refutation of Infidel publications, with Sir J. Bland Burges at the head, which commenced its proceedings by a vote for the immediate printing and circulating of a large edition of Mr. Bellamy's "Anti-Deist." How that association was dissolved "at a moment when," to use the chairman's subsequent words, "not a prelate, not a clergyman had stood forward to stem the tide of blasphemy which threatened the subversion of our religion and government," was never, I believe, publicly known. Not being myself in the confidence of the party most concerned, I cannot satisfactorily solve the question; for, although a report has prevailed that the venerable Society in Bartlett's Buildings took up the cause, which induced Sir J. Bland Burges's association to resign, yet the circumstance of the former's having only republished a series of old tracts, which, though excellent in their way, were by no means calculated to answer in detail "the perpetually repeated cavils of the opposers of Divine revelation," would seem to argue against the truth of such a report. Mr. Bellamy's "Anti-Deist," however, was duly published, though I have been given to understand at his own cost; and should there be a Deist in the kingdom left, sufficiently able to cope with the author in He-

brew, and equally well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, it would be the highest treat, as likely to be productive of the most beneficial consequences, to find them combating together. For such a conflict Mr. Bellamy may probably long wait in vain!

Apologizing for the digression here made from the main object of this letter, which was to exculpate Mr. Bellamy and his friend Sir J. Bland Burges from the undue censure of Mr. Horne, I now beg leave to return to the Baronet.

I have at this moment before me the "Reasons in Favour of a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures, by Sir James Bland Burges, Bart.," as also his "Reply to the Rev. Mr. Todd's Vindication," &c. Believe me, Mr. Editor, I have scrupulously examined every page in both, nay, I have even endeavoured to amuse myself in twisting and turning occasional passages in them; but, again, not an expression have I found in either, which, as before said, could be tortured, save by the grossest and most wilful perversion, into an assertion *that our present authorized English Version of the Holy Scriptures is totally insufficient for teaching all things necessary for salvation.* This is certainly nothing more than a mere negation on my part; but, on the other hand, it is opposed to the simple assertion of Mr. Horne, who has quoted neither page nor paragraph where the obnoxious expression is to be met with; as both pamphlets are, however, open to the public, your readers will be best able to judge for themselves, whether Sir James deserves the censure thus passed on him or not, and by their decision I am very willing to abide.

And here, by the way of a second digression, which, however, I apprehend may collaterally aid in proving Mr. Horne to have laboured under a grievous mistake when writing as above, I would observe that a perusal of the Baronet's "Reasons," &c., will amply repay the unprejudiced reader for his trouble, whilst his short "Reply to Mr. Todd," written with all that force of reasoning and critical acumen for which Sir James is eminently distinguished, most satisfactorily assists in proving, amongst the rest,

1st. That the Septuagint of our day is not the same which was in use in our Saviour's time.

2nd. That the Vulgate contains numerous instances of mistranslations from the Hebrew, and servile traductions from the Septuagint.

3rd. That although in some places our own authorized Version approaches nearer to the true sense of the original than that of Jerome does, yet in an infinite majority of passages it can be regarded no otherwise than as a close translation of the latter, and from its discordance with the original text cannot possibly have been directly translated from it.

As Sir James confirms his assertion of the incorrectness of our authorized Version by the testimony of a number of witnesses, it cannot be wondered at that Mr. Horne should come forward also, in opposition to the Baronet, with the list to which allusion has already been made, in support of its general fidelity, and for the purpose of denying the pressing necessity of a revision. The evidence on both sides is sufficiently curious to warrant an abridgment of it being given here; if, therefore, for the better accomplishment of this purpose, the testimony of Mr. Whittaker, in Mr. Horne's statement, and the assertions of Mr. Todd be set off against those of Mr. Bellamy and Sir James Bland Burges, as being parties alike interested in the decision; and, if further, the testimony of Selden, as to the mode in which our Version was got up, be omitted on both sides, a concession which Mr. Horne may the more readily make, as Selden's account rather operates to his prejudice than otherwise, the following may be considered as a pretty fair recapitulation of it:

Sir J. BLAND BURGESS

proving the incorrectness of our authorized Version, and the necessity of a revision.

Bishop Lowth.—"And here I cannot but mention that nothing would more effectually conduce to this end," (the illus.

Rev. Mr. HORNE

in support of the correctness of our authorized Version, and disproving the necessity of a revision.

Bishop Lowth.—"The vulgar translation of the Bible is the best standard of our language."

(Sir J. BLAND BURGESS.)

(Rev. Mr. HORNE.)

tration and confirmation of the truth of the Holy Scriptures,) "*than the exhibiting of the Holy Scriptures themselves to the people in a more advantageous and just light, by an accurate revisal of our Vulgar Translation by public authority. This hath often been represented, and, I hope, will not always be represented in vain.*"

"These valuable remains of that great and good man (Archbishop Secker) will be of infinite service when that *necessary work*, a new translation, or a revision of the present translation of the Holy Scriptures shall be undertaken."

"The present English translation, as to style and language, admits but of little improvement; but, *in respect of the sense and the accuracy of interpretation, the improvements of which it is capable, are great and numberless.*"

Dr. Waterland.—"Our English translation is undoubtedly capable of very great improvements."

Dr. Kennicott.—"Sunt certe, et li magni nominis viri, qui versionem impense flagitant perfectiorem."

"During the long extent of years since our last translation was made, *many imperfections and errors in it have been discovered by learned men.*"

Bishop Walton.—"The last English translation, made by divers learned men at the command of King James, though it may justly contend with any now extant in any other language in Europe, was yet carped and cavilled at by divers among ourselves; especially by one," (Hugh Broughton, Fellow of Christ College, Cambridge,) "who, being passed by, and not employed in the work, as one though skilled in the Hebrew, yet of little or no judgment in that or any other kind of learning, was so highly offended that he would needs undertake to shew *how many thousand places they had falsely rendered, when as he could hardly make good his undertaking in any.*"

Bishop Horsley.—"When the translators in James the First's time began their work, they prescribed to themselves some rules, which it may not be amiss for all translators to follow. Their reverence for the Sacred Scriptures induced them to be as literal as they could, to avoid obscurity; and it must be acknowledged that they were extremely happy in the simplicity and dignity of their expressions. *Their adherence to the Hebrew idiom is supposed at once to have enriched and adorned our language; and as they laboured for the general benefit of the learned and the unlearned, they avoided all words of Latin original, when they could find words in their own language, even with the aid of adverbs and prepositions, which would express their meaning.*"*

* Mr. Jevans, in *The Monthly Repository* for February, (p. 82,) quotes the following: "Bishop Horsley, speaking of the Seventy having translated Jehovah, Lord, says," (Sermons, III. 6—8,) "*Later translators have followed their mischievous example,—mischievous in its consequences, though innocently meant,—and our English translators, among the rest, in innumerable instances, for the original Jehovah,*"

(Sir J. BLAND BURGESS.)

Blackwell (Sacred Classics).—"An accurate translation, proved and supported by sound criticism, would quash and silence most of the objections of pert and profane cavillers. It would likewise remove the scruples of many pious and conscientious Christians."

"Innumerable instances may be shewn in the English Bible of faulty translations of the divine original, which either weaken its sense, or debase and tarnish the beauty of its language."

"A new translation can give no offence to people of sound judgment and consideration; because every body conversant in these matters, and unprejudiced, must acknowledge that *there was less occasion to change the old version into the present, than to change the present into a new one.*"

Dr. Durell.—"The Version now in use certainly does not exhibit in many places the sense of the text, and mistakes it, besides, in an infinite number of instances. It may justly be questioned, whether any possible sense can, by fair interpretation, be deduced from the words in not a few places."

"By a new translation, the caviller, the sceptic and the deist would find the sharpest and most trusty arrows of their quiver blunted."

Dr. Symonds.—"Whoever examines our Version in present use, with the least degree of attention, will find that it is ambiguous and incorrect, even in matters of the highest importance. Experience teaches us that mistakes in religion are of all others the most pernicious; not only because they affect us in the most important concerns, but as they are the most difficult to be corrected: and it might almost be questioned, whether it would not be safer to take the Bible out of the hands of the common people, than to expose them to the danger of drawing false conclusions from erroneous translations; for it is doubtless much worse to be misled than to be ignorant."

"The ambiguities in our Version are very numerous, and sometimes too gross to be defended."

which ought upon all occasions to have been religiously retained, have put the more general name of Lord. A flagrant instance of this occurs in that solemn proem of the Decalogue in the xxth chapter of Exodus, &c.; and another example of the same unhappy alteration is to be found in the cxth Psalm," &c. &c.

* In the Preface to his Family Expositor, Dr. Doddridge has observed, that "the Old Testament has suffered much more than the New in our translation."

(Rev. Mr. HORNE.)

Bishop Middleton.—"The style of our present Version is incomparably superior to any thing which might be expected from the finical and perverted taste of our own age. It is simple, it is energetic; and, which is of no small importance, use has made it familiar, and time has rendered it sacred."

Dr. Geddes.—"The highest eulogiums have been made on the translation of James the First, both by our own writers and foreigners. And, indeed, if accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest attention to the letter of the text be supposed to constitute the qualities of an excellent Version, this of all versions must, in general, be accounted the most excellent. Every sentence, every word, every syllable, every letter and point seem to have been weighed with the nicest exactitude, and expressed either in the text or margin with the greatest precision. Pagninus himself is hardly more literal; and it was well remarked by Robertson, above a hundred years ago, that it may serve for a lexicon of the Hebrew language, as well as for a translation."

Dr. Doddridge.—"On a diligent comparison of our translation with the original, we find that of the New Testament, and, I might also add, that of the Old, in the main faithful and judicious. You know, indeed, that we do not scruple on some occasions to animadvert upon it; but you also know, that these remarks affect not the fundamentals of religion, and seldom reach any further than the beauty of a figure, or, at most, the connexion of an argument."*

(Sir J. BLAND BURGESS.)

Dr. Blayney.—"A new translation of the Scriptures has long been devoutly wished by many of the best friends to religion and our Established Church, who sorrowfully confess that *our present Version is still far from being so perfect as it might and should be; that it has mistaken the true sense of the Hebrew in not a few places, and sometimes substituted an interpretation so obscure and perplexed, that it becomes almost impossible to make out with it any sense at all.* And if this be the case, *shall we not be solicitous to obtain a remedy for such glaring imperfections? Can we with certainty foresee all the mischief that may possibly and eventually result from an error, of what kind soever, wilfully retained in a book of such high and universal importance? Are we not taught to believe that all and every part of Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is, according to the intention of the donor, profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness? But can any Scripture be profitable, except it be understood? And if not rightly understood, may not the perversion of it be proportionably dangerous? Or is it nothing to deprive the people of that edification which they might have received, had a fair and just exposition been substituted instead of a false one? Do we not know the advantage that is commonly taken by the enemies of revelation of triumphing in objections plausibly raised against the Divine word upon the basis of an unsound text or wrong translation? And though these objections have been refuted over and over again, by the most solid argumentations of private religionists, do they not still continue to ring them in the ears of the vulgar and unlearned Christian, as if they were owned and admitted to be unanswerable? So that it seems requisite for the honour of God and his true religion, that these stumbling blocks should be removed out of the way, as soon as possible, by a solemn and public disavowal. Let the work of purifying and reforming what is amiss in the present edition of our Bible be fairly and honestly set about."*

Dr. Pilkington.—"These instances are here mentioned to shew the benefit and expediency of a more correct and intelligible translation of the Bible than we have at present."

Archbishop Secker.—"Novam Scripturæ Versionem desiderari plurimis videtur: nempe ut populus Christianus eâ luce fruatur, quæ, favente numine, oraculis divinis per continuas virorum doc-

(Rev. Mr. HORNE.)

Dr. John Taylor (of Norwich). "In above the space of one (*now two*) hundred years, learning may have received considerable improvements; and by that means, some inaccuracies may be found in a translation more than a (*two*) hundred years old. But you may rest fully satisfied, that as *our English translation is in itself by far the most excellent book in our language, so it is a pure and plentiful fountain of Divine knowledge, giving a TRUE, CLEAR and FULL account of the Divine dispensations, and of the gospel of our salvation: insomuch that whoever studies the Bible, THE ENGLISH BIBLE, is sure of gaining that knowledge and faith which, if duly applied to the heart and conversation, WILL INFALLIBLY GUIDE HIM TO ETERNAL LIFE.*"

Dr. James Beattie.—"It is a striking beauty in our English Bible, that though the language is always elegant and nervous, and for the most part very harmonious, the words are all plain and common;—no affectation of learned terms, or of words of Greek and Latin etymology."

(Sir J. BLAND BURGES.)

(Rev. Mr. HORNE.)

torum vigilias affulsit, his 150 annis proxime elapsis ante quos confecta est Anglica Versio. *Et quis refragetur honestissimæ petitioni?*

Archbishop Newcome.—“Let any competent scholar study the Bible in the original tongues, and then pronounce whether our authorized Version is not capable of amendment and improvement in numberless places, many of which must be considered as very important.”

“It is my full persuasion, that whatever tends to the perfection of our Establishment, would not shake it, but give it splendour, strength and security; and that a version of the Scriptures, as accurate as the united learning of the present age could make it, would reflect the highest honour on our National Church, and hold a distinguished place among those treasures which would fix it on a basis as firm as truth, virtue and Christianity.”

“The arguments of the Deists are either general speculative objections, or absurdities imputed to the Sacred Writings. Many difficulties of the latter class are superficial ones, arising from an ignorance of the original languages, and would vanish from the text by judicious renderings.”

“Were a version of the Bible executed in a manner suitable to the undertaking, such a measure would have a direct tendency to establish the faith of thousands, to open their understandings, to warm their hearts, to enliven their devotions, and to delight their imaginations.”

Now, let the candid and unbiassed reader examine the authority of the witnesses here produced on both sides, and the nature of their testimony; let him, at the same time, remember that the witnesses quoted by Sir J. Bland Burges are the same whom Archbishop Newcome has brought forward to establish the necessity of a new translation of the Holy Scriptures, or, at least, of a revisal of our authorized Version, but whom Mr. Todd, the Librarian of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, and Mr. Horne, the Curate of Christ's Church and St. Leonard's, have thought proper to call in to their assistance to prove the very reverse, and surely he cannot for a moment doubt on which side there must be a great mistake. That Mr. Horne, in attempting to shew that our authorized Version needs no revisal, should rest mainly on the evidence of an Arian, a Deist, (whom he taxes with “bold and unmeasured assertions,” and whose Version and Commentaries he censures as “heterodox,”) and two Dissenters, appears contrary to all etiquette, and to betray an error, a grave mistake in judgment. That he should further have regarded the circumstance of a man (who “though skilled in the Hebrew tongue, possessed little or no judgment in that or any other kind of learning,”) not having pointed out the thousand errors in our authorized Version, which he asserted it contains, or have considered a string of eulogiums on the style of it, as positive testimonies in favour of its fidelity as a translation, are mistakes which cannot fail to strike every one who reads the evidence he brings forward under the sanction of Bishops Walton, Lowth, Horsley, Middleton and others; and, that he should gravely add his eleven testimonies to those which he says have been previously collected by Archbishop Newcome and Mr. Todd, only further proves (what, indeed, any reader of his valuable compilation will not

Dr. Adam Clarke.—“Those who have compared most of the European translations with the original, have not scrupled to say that the English translation of the Bible, made under the direction of King James the First, is the most accurate and faithful of the whole. Nor is this its only praise: the translators have seized the very spirit and soul of the original, and expressed this almost every where with pathos and energy. Besides, our translators have not only made a standard translation; but they have made their translation the standard of our language: the English tongue was not equal to such a work—but God enabled them to stand as upon Mount Sinai, and crane up their country's language to the dignity of the originals, so that after the lapse of two hundred years the English Bible is, with very few exceptions, the standard of the purity and excellence of the English tongue. The original, from which it was taken, is alone superior to the Bible translated by the authority of King James.”

be long in finding out,) that he has in this, as in other instances, committed the glaring mistake of trusting rather to second-hand testimony and mere hearsay evidence, than of consulting the original witnesses themselves. It will now appear clear to your readers why I submitted to the chance of being deemed a proser, by introducing a subject apparently foreign to the avowed object of this letter, when I quoted the results established by Sir J. Bland Burges's pamphlets. The fact is, by proving a tissue of mistakes on the part of Mr. Horne, in that particular portion of his "Introduction" in which Mr. Bellamy and Sir J. Bland Burges are so unceremoniously handled, his mistake in regard to them is more easily accounted for; and though it is to be regretted that errors of this description, so derogatory to the character of a clergyman, (inasmuch as they seem to be dictated by a spirit of malevolence,) have appeared under his sanction, I am willing to acquit him personally of any uncharitable design, rather attributing their insertion to the mistaken zeal of some coadjutor or amanuensis, who may have been employed in collecting the materials from which his work is compiled.

I now conclude, tendering my hearty thanks to Mr. Horne for his "Introduction," which, though defective in some parts, and containing but little important original matter, must yet, as a book of reference, be considered a valuable compilation; but I am still more indebted to him for the manner in which Mr. Bellamy and Sir J. Bland Burges are introduced therein; since, in all probability, but for that, I should never have read the elegant pamphlet of the Baronet, and the truly learned and (with Mr. Horne's permission) orthodox work of the translator, whom I scruple not to consider as a most enlightened biblical critic, and assuredly one of the first Hebrew scholars of our day.

ד' אמונים.

SIR,

March, 1824.

A PROPOSAL for a new translation of the Bible having been suggested in your last Number, I crave leave to offer a few remarks upon the subject. Mr. Jevans has confined his observations (pp. 81—83) to one particular, viz. the substitu-

tion of the great and peculiar name of the Deity, wherever it is employed in the original, instead of the terms commonly used in our version; the importance and propriety of which alteration, he has very ably enforced: but it is evident that there is much more to be done in this case, if we desire a popular as well as a faithful and judicious translation of the Holy Scriptures.

That our authorized Version of the Bible, *as a whole*, excels all others in the English language, is, I believe, the general and established opinion. Like its great original, it is simple and sublime: and were this opinion more variable at present, than it was formerly, it is presumed, that in a question of literary taste, the judgment of such men as Swift and Addison, Johnson and Blair, might be almost deemed decisive. Now these authors have uniformly borne testimony to its general merit. "No translation," says the Dean, "our country ever produced, hath come up to that of the Old and New Testament. The translators of the Bible were masters of an English style, much fitter for that work than any we see in our present writings; which, I take to be owing to the *simplicity* that runs through the whole, and which is one of the greatest perfections in any language."* Now, if we examine most of the modern English translations by this rule, we shall find them grievously deficient. The obscure or awkward expressions occasionally to be met with in the common Bible, seem to have arisen chiefly from inadvertence; but our new translators appear to have laboured for awkward expressions, and taken pains to render themselves obscure: a selection of phrases might easily be made from their works, which, putting *taste* out of the question, bid defiance to the human understanding. Now, if you take away from the venerable *simplicity* of the Scriptures, you detract from their energy and usefulness. We forget the Patriarchs and the Prophets; "the sweet Psalmist of Israel;" the great Teacher and Prophet of Nazareth; the Apostle of the Gentiles; and the Fishermen of Galilee; when we see them arrayed in the

* Letter to the Lord High Treasurer.

ascetic garb of a modern novel, adopting the pedantic phraseology of linguists and grammarians, or the superficial eloquence of courts and assemblies. It is true, we should be governed by the *sense*, rather than the sound of Scripture; and one translation *as such*, is no more sacred than another: but alas! we are frail and imperfect beings, uniting animal organs with mental capacities; and "He who knoweth our frame," instructs us in the manner best adapted to our state. The language, indeed, is human, but the mode and construction are divine: and, as one well observes, "If in reading the Scriptures, we could but imbibe a portion of that spirit with which they were written; we should not need, as we now do, such volumes of instruction, but might become virtuous by an *epitome*."* This peculiarity of style and manner (without adverting to the question of inspiration) is obvious, even in the narrative parts of Scripture; how much more, in the pathetic and the sublime! And, if we are compelled to acknowledge, either the singular judgment, or the singular felicity of our translators in their great work, as to its general correspondence both in sentiment and manner with the originals, we cannot, we ought not, we will not part with so invaluable a treasure.† But this ineffable spirit, this divine euphony, which strikes at once to the heart, seems to have been in a great measure unknown by some of their successors: they may have been very erudite in the ancient languages, but they have made lamentable work with their own. Green's Version of the Psalms, is neither poetry, nor prose, nor rhythm: in the New Testament, the change of the terms, Grace, for "Favour;" alas! for "woe;" and happy, for "blessed;" noticed by Dr. Carpenter, are perfectly childish: it is Stoical rant, and not Christian consolation, to tell a man on the rack, or under persecution for conscience' sake, that he is "happy," but he may be "blessed," or happy *in reversion*. What fresh knowledge will the "hewers of wood and drawers of water," the plain persons of the

congregation acquire, by hearing that the good Samaritan took out "two denarii," instead of "two pence," for the purposes of benevolence? or, that Peter took from the mouth of the fish, "half a shekel," instead of "a piece of money"? Read to a man of the world, the parable of the Prodigal Son, in Dr. Harwood's Introduction to the New Testament, (a valuable work on the whole,) and you will make him laugh;* read to him the same parable (if you *can* read) in the common Version, and you will make him tremble. "Come now, and let us reason together," says the Almighty to the rebellious Israelites, by the mouth of the Prophet Isaiah: "Come now, and let us *settle the affair*!" says the translation of an eminent modern Hebraist.† Again, the word *Kurios*, it is allowed, sometimes admits of a familiar sense, and our old translators have occasionally so applied it—"Sir, we would see Jesus—Sir, I have no man to put me into the pool—Sir, I perceive that thou art a Prophet:" but to have rendered it thus, in the peculiar circumstances of Saul at Damascus, "Who art thou, Sir?" must surely be deemed passing strange! "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy," says our New Testament; "If any man corrupt the temple of God, God shall corrupt him!" says the Version of Archbishop Newcome. Now, though the Greek verb in both sentences is the same, yet having been certainly applied by the sacred writer in different senses, our translators have wisely adopted a different phraseology.‡ But it is an easy matter to find fault; and "Ubi plurima nitent, &c." It is presumed, however, that the *nitentes*—the shining parts of most of the new versions, will be found chiefly in those places where they have adhered to the language of the Old Bible, and not where they have departed from it, as they often have done, without any apparent necessity.

* "A gentleman had two sons," &c.

† Not Bishop Lowth.

‡ The writer excepts from these remarks, Mr. Wellbeloved's forthcoming Bible, and the *later* editions of the New Version, not having seen them.

* Relig. Medic.

† See Say's Essays, 1745.

But, notwithstanding these remarks, our common Version has its defects. It contains vulgarisms, mis-translations, and a few interpolations. As to the first, which are to be met with chiefly in the Old Testament, it may be observed, that that may be a vulgarism in English, which is not so in Greek or Hebrew, owing to the difference in languages, customs and manners. Perhaps, in some parts of the Levitical law, which was necessarily precise and determinate, it was not possible to avoid such renderings, consistently with the *faithfulness* of a translation; but, in other parts where there is nothing but an idiom or a popular manner of speech, the simple term might have been changed, without any injury to the sense. Dr. Watts mentions some of these, in his Treatise on Logic. To name only one instance, "The Lord taketh not pleasure in the legs of a man:" this is both uncouth and unintelligible: it is an Hebraism, and might have been rendered thus—"He delighteth not in the strength of the horse; he taketh not pleasure in the power of a man:" that is, mere human advantages or accomplishments do not recommend us to God. Of the mistranslations, *two* only shall be mentioned. We often meet in the Epistles of St. Paul, with this phrase, "God forbid!" And, perhaps, the mere English reader may startle to be told, that there is no such expression in the Bible: for a pious Jew, or a primitive Christian, would have been shocked to employ such language. In the Greek, it is what is called a *negation*; and is properly changed by the moderns into the phrase, "by no means," or, "that cannot be." In this case, therefore, our old translators have, unawares, encouraged *profaneness*, under the seeming authority of Scripture.

The other instance is in Philipp. ii., where the apostle speaking of our Saviour, says of him, "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:" the first clause is a *figure*, the last, a *mistranslation*, which every plain man who reads his Bible with understanding may be certain of, without the help of the learned: for how can any being, how glorious and excellent soever, be "equal with God"? "To whom will ye liken me, or shall I be equal,

saith the Holy One?" But the words in the Greek are, "*isa Theon*," "like unto God;" a mode of speech common with the heathen writers, in the celebration of their heroes; and peculiarly applicable to our Divine Master, on account of the high offices and character which he sustained in the great work of human redemption: and the sense of the whole passage appears to be this—that we should endeavour to acquire and exercise the most profound humility from the example of our Lord, "who being in the form of God," that is, invested with God-like capacities and powers, in accomplishing, under God, the salvation of mankind; was not anxious or solicitous, to display his peculiar character and extraordinary gifts, at all seasons, and upon all occasions, as a weak or ambitious mind would have been disposed to do; but on the contrary, "made himself of no reputation," abased himself to the lowest condition of humanity, even to "the form of a servant," to a state of suffering, and "to the death of the cross," to fulfil the purposes of the Divine benevolence: "Wherefore, God hath highly exalted him:" and we may form some idea of this exalted character of Christ, and of the beauty and propriety of the Apostle's illustration of it in this place, if we consider how difficult it is, in common life, for persons of extraordinary qualifications and endowments, to restrain the exercise of them within due limits, and to apply them only to their proper uses. Health and strength, beauty, wit, learning, eloquence, riches, power, these gifts of God in the world of nature; instead of promoting the happiness of their possessors, and the benefit of the world around them, are too often perverted to the injury of both: nay, even virtue itself, by passing into extremes, may degenerate into vice. (Eccles. vii. 16.) But here, our Lord came off completely victorious: though "tempted in all points as we are, he was yet without sin." Though invested with prodigious power, he never misapplied it: though constituted "Lord of all," he became "the servant of all;" and has now "a name given him, above every name, to the glory of God the Father."

Of the *interpolations* in our common Bible, which are but few, and

most of which have been detected in the modern Versions, one instance shall suffice. Dean Swift preached a Sermon on the *Three Witnesses*, in St. John's First Epistle; from whence he endeavoured to deduce the Athanasian doctrine: the Sermon remains, but the text is acknowledged to be spurious, by the most orthodox writers.

The reader is desired not hastily to conclude, that there is any inconsistency in these remarks. The sum is this: our authorized Version is an invaluable treasure, which, nevertheless, requires a *revision*; and which circumstance it is to be hoped, will, in due time, engage the attention of those whom it may concern; for this, as it should seem, is a case in which Christian magistrates and Christian legislatures may lawfully interfere, without being chargeable with *intrusion*; a case in which kings and queens may truly become "nursing fathers and nursing mothers to the church," namely, by taking proper measures to provide for the body of Christian professors, in the respective communities over which they preside, a faithful, plain and judicious translation into their native language of the Holy Scriptures: and let those persons who shall, hereafter, be engaged in this great work in our own land, whether clerical or laic, proceed with all imaginable delicacy, with a wholesome fear and caution as to the particulars here enumerated, which appear to comprise the chief of what is wanting; not departing from the simplicity, energy and pathos, of the venerable volume bequeathed to us by our forefathers, without absolute necessity, lest their work meet with the fate of some of the modern "humble attempts," either to drop still-born from the press, or, to remain in the libraries of the learned, apt indeed for *consultation*, but totally unfit for general use.

R.

P. S. Lawrence Howel's History of the Bible, 1718, contains many useful hints on this subject; particularly as to the mistakes in *numerals* in the Old-Testament History of Jephthah, &c., which astonish the plain reader, and furnish matter for the sneer of the sceptic.

Islington,
April 10, 1824.

SIR,

I HAVE read with pleasure the Rev. Edward Irving's *Orations for the Oracles of God, &c.*, but not with a blind and indiscriminate admiration. I am not insensible of the defects by which they are characterized, and which have been censured with the utmost severity. His critics have especially reprobated his use of *antiquated words* and *obsolete expressions*, drawn from Jeremy Taylor, from Isaac Barrow, and more particularly from John Milton's prose and poetry. Some, however, have commended his peculiarity of style, whilst others altogether denounce it. In my humble opinion, a *middle course* should be steered, just such a course as Pope thus happily delineates in his Postscript to the *Odyssey*. As I have not the pleasure of personally knowing the Rev. Mr. Irving, I will transcribe the paragraph, that it may reach him through the medium of your widely-circulating Miscellany. Influenced by no hostility to his preaching or authorship, he may, probably, thank me for it. Caressed and admired as he is by a large portion of the religious world, I am persuaded that he is not, like a spoiled child, unsuspensible of improvement.

"A just and moderate mixture of *old words*," (says Mr. Pope,) "may have an effect, like the working of old abbey-stones into a building, which I have sometimes seen to give a kind of venerable air, and yet not destroy the neatness, elegance, and equality requisite to a *new work*, I mean without rendering it too unfamiliar or remote from the present purity of writing, or from that ease and smoothness which ought always to accompany narration or dialogue. In reading a style *judiciously* antiquated, one finds a pleasure not unlike that of travelling on an old Roman way, but then the road must be as good as the way is ancient, the style must be such, in which we may evenly proceed without being put to short stops by sudden abruptnesses, or puzzled by frequent turnings and transpositions. No man delights in furrows and stumbling blocks; and let our love of antiquity be ever so great, a *fine ruin* is one thing, and an *heap of rubbish*

another! The imitators of Milton, like most other imitators, are not copies but *caricatures* of their original; they are an hundred times more obscure and cramp than he, and equally so in all places; whereas it should have been observed of Milton, that he is not lavish of his *exotic* words and phrases every where alike, but employs them much more where the subject is marvellous, vast and strange, as in the scenes of *heaven*, *hell* and *chaos*, than where it is turned to the natural and agreeable, as in the pictures of *Paradise*, the loves of our *first parents*, and the entertainments of *angels*!"

Having animadverted on the theological complection of the Rev. E. Irving's work, the preceding remarks upon the literary merits of the production may close my animadversions, and not prove unacceptable to the readers of your Miscellany.

Of all his "unregenerate critics," the *Westminster Review* furnishes the best account of his work, and to that excellent periodical publication I refer with satisfaction. Never was a *poor author* visited with such extremes of approbation and of disapprobation. One of his admirers denominates him "the Northern eagle grasping in his talons the thunderbolt and scattering abroad the lightning;" whilst a diurnal critic represents his production no better than that of "a school boy, which his master flings back into his face for its nonsense and inaccuracy." Both of these statements cannot be true, and, indeed, neither is deserving of attention. Mr. Irving is, no doubt, a man of talent and acquirement; his *work*, though not Calvinistic, breathes a spirit of benevolence and piety. I only wish *the style* was more pure and chaste, agreeably to the above masterly suggestions of Pope, and that it had not been so deformed by that horrid anti-scriptural doctrine of *eternal misery*! But I must check my pen: my only aim is to render Mr. Irving justice, entertaining for the sons of *Caledonia* a regard arising from having finished my education amongst them, and passed pleasantly an early portion of my life in their society. I had the happiness of knowing and enjoying the instructions of *Campbell* and *Ger-*

rard, of *Blair* and *Robertson*, luminaries that would have adorned any church, and been a blessing to any civilized community.

J. EVANS.

Mr. Le Grice on his Correspondence with Sir Rose Price, Bart., in Reply to I. W.

*Penzance,
April 9th, 1834.*

SIR,

AS my Correspondence with Sir Rose Price appeared in the public newspapers, I have no right to complain of your inserting it in your Repository; but have rather reason to be satisfied with the candid manner in which you have printed it; for candour may be visible even from the *mode* of *printing*. At the end of the Correspondence appears a Summary of it, dated from Plymouth, and signed I. W. Of this I have great reason to complain; though, if the reader should peruse the whole of the Correspondence, this statement will do little harm. The danger, however, is, that most readers will turn from the tediousness of a long correspondence to a *summary*, which from its very title promises brevity; and where a writer takes upon himself the office of a judge, truth and justice are to be expected, though there might be a failure of ability and discrimination. Surely the writer could not have entertained an idea that the Correspondence would have appeared in your pages, or he would not have ventured to have published such an incorrect account. He calls me "a flaming son of the Church." On the grammatical propriety of this epithet I shall make no remark: we all know the meaning of it. All I shall say is, that it does not in the very outset of the Summary bespeak the impartiality of the judge; and I trust that if he will take the trouble to ask my character in the town of which I am minister, (and I refer him to those who *dissent* from our Church,) he will find that I do not deserve it. He dates his letter from Plymouth, and therefore need not be a stranger to the character of a person almost a neighbour. However, the tone of his language is of small moment, and if a hundred such epithets had been used, I should not have taken notice of them; but positive misstatements demand ob-

servation. These I shall expose; for of these I have a right to complain. I shall simply state them without any comment or epithet. There is great incorrectness in the *arrangement* of facts, which gives a wrong colour to the whole transaction; but I shall not descend into minute particulars of this sort. When I shew the reader that the Summary contains assertions which are not true, I must leave him to judge of the correctness of the Summary altogether.

I. W. says that "the attention of the public was *first* called to the subject, by a long address of five columns of close, small print in a newspaper; and that the next week brought out a reply from the Baronet, dated 3d February."

What will the reader say of the correctness of this statement, which professes to be a Summary, &c., when he may see in your Repository that the first letter was a short one, dated January 14th, and that my long letter was not the first, but a reply to a long communication from Sir Rose Price, dated January 21st?—a vindication of myself.

Secondly, I. W. says, and he writes the passage as a quotation between inverted commas, giving the following passage as my words, "Mr. Le Grice remarks, 'That he (Sir Rose Price) had gone to London and got himself introduced to Dr. Pearson, the King's private chaplain and spiritual adviser, and through his means had become acquainted with the fact of the King's private opinions; which he would not have discovered, had Dr. P. been cautioned against the insidious design of the Baronet.'" These expressions are given as mine—as if used by me. I never used these expressions. I never said that Sir R. P. saw Dr. Pearson; nor is any such expression to be found in my Correspondence as "*which he would not have discovered*," &c. I. W. cannot excuse himself by saying, such a meaning might be *implied*. He professes to *sum up*, to act as a judge, and he gives words as mine, which I never used, and omits a letter of mine, (see Repository, p. 149,) which would have cleared up any misconception.

I. W. says, "A meeting was called, and Sir Rose Price soon received a copy of their resolution to displace

him, and appoint his friend Le Grice in his room." No such resolution was ever passed; nor does Sir R. P. ever declare that he received any such. —Mr. Canon Rogers was appointed. What shall we say for the accuracy of such a summing up?

But now, Sir, I come to a most serious charge. I. W. has accused me wrongfully and shamefully: he has given expressions as mine which I never used: he introduces the charge deliberately, and comments on it deliberately; and therefore it is not an inference drawn in haste. Indeed, if it were, this would be no excuse, for he professes to give a Summary, which implies analysis and due examination. He says, "Sir Rose Price is charged by Le Grice 'with endeavouring to get into Parliament, that he might attempt the overthrow of the Church altogether.'" These words, which I never used, are given as a *quotation*. I. W. goes on to say, "Respecting such a line of conduct, he (Le Grice) observes that, 'Whoever shall presume to innovate, alter, or misrepresent any point in the Articles of the Church of England, ought to be arraigned as a traitor to the State; heterodoxy in the one naturally introducing heterodoxy in the other: a crime which it concerns the Civil magistrate to restrain and punish, as well as the Ecclesiastical.'" I. W. then proceeds to comment on "such language as this."

Now what will any man of common feeling and honesty say (I will make no comment myself) when I declare that no such expressions were ever uttered or written by me? In what a light must I have been viewed, if this Summary had been printed without the Correspondence! The whole of the Summary is very incorrect; but having exhibited such positive misstatements, I need add nothing more than that I am, &c. &c.

C. V. LE GRICE.

P. S. I. W. has in the above Summary treated me in such a manner, that he deprives me of the pleasure which I should have had in shewing him my Reply to "The Unitarian Doctrine Briefly Stated," in which I agree with him in sentiment on "*religious consistency*." Indeed if he had exercised only common observation,

he would have seen that my contest has been not with principles, but with conduct *connected with* principles.—How can a man be attached to the Church, who believes that the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John are spurious? How can a man receive the sacrament, who believes that our Saviour was the son of Joseph? I honour and esteem the Dissenter whose conduct is consistent with his principles.

N. B. The author of "The Unitarian Doctrine," &c. has in a subsequent pamphlet avowed his belief of the miraculous conception, which places him, I think, at an immense distance from the Evansonian.

March 26th, 1824.

SIR,

IN common with all the friends of humanity, your readers have doubtless been taking a deep and anxious interest in the recent measures of our government for the mitigation of colonial slavery. The termination of their labours, while it may not have perhaps reached the expectations or have satisfied the hopes of the more zealous advocates of the cause, must yet be considered as a glorious, and, as far as it does go, a valuable triumph of public opinion. The foundation that has thus been laid, by the wise and salutary code for the future regulation of one colony (Trinidad), can but be viewed as the corner-stone of an edifice that can only be completed by the final and absolute extinction of a system from which every better feeling of the heart revolts, and every principle of religion and humanity is alike abhorrent.

As the law now constituted for this colony has been divulged for the avowed object of ascertaining, as an experiment, the practicability of its general application as the basis of a system directed to the ultimate extinction of slavery, it will become a matter of curious and not uninteresting speculation to attend to the impressions it may produce both on the objects of its legislation—the negroes themselves—and of their employers. And these impressions it will be more particularly deserving our attention to notice, for calculating on the probable success of the measure, in their influence on the

minds of each of these classes in the *un-mitigated* colonies, if by such a title one may be allowed to designate the islands yet deprived of these ameliorations.

With respect to the impressions on the negroes of these colonies, what can we suppose will be their feelings on discovering that so large a portion of the evils which their suffering race has for so many generations been enduring, are now removed, and that one favoured though but comparatively small portion of their number, are no longer exposed to the degradations and severities which they are still doomed to suffer? What will they think of the securities and privileges for the protection of their persons and their property which have been ceded to others, while it is not to be (at present at least) their happy allotment to share them? Will they be content to go on in hopeless drudgery, patiently bearing the more-than-ever galling yoke that fetters them, and which it can be no more justice that they should bear, than their happier compatriots at Trinidad? If it be justice and policy that an improved system of treatment, founded on principles of lenity and protection, should be granted to one portion of the transported Africans, what is the ground to justify the denial of these advantages to the rest of them, or to reconcile themselves to the continuance of a system by which they are to remain deprived of the boon?

With respect again to the proprietors of the *un-mitigated* colonies—on this point we have scarcely to wait the issue of time to learn the impression likely to be produced on their minds. Already has the mortified and angered tone of those who trusted to their clamour on the long-dreaded and loudly-deprecated dangers of innovation to silence the voice of humanity in behalf of the suffering slave; already has that tone evinced the impression felt in this quarter. On one side we now hear of nothing but the impracticability of enforcing such idle and speculative theories of legislation—of the danger of demolishing that *discretionary* principle of coercion, to the existence and exercise of which, for the security of his property and the cultivation of his estates, the planter had only to look. On the other side we hear, that if the

code laid down be enforced in any thing like a spirit of sincere and active execution, vain will it be to expect that the remaining colonies can ever more be kept in a state of tranquil subordination, without alike extending to them the same wild and disorganizing liberties. We may bid adieu to the security of our property, and that which is already depressed beyond measure in its value, will have but a short reign to run, before it becomes a dead and profitless waste!

Such are the actual reasonings and the loud deprecations of those who have founded their views of the security of colonial interests on the existence and perpetuation of a system over which humanity sheds the tear of its warmest sympathy, and to the abolition of which, its most fervent energies are directed. The friend of humanity, however, will hail the amelioration now granted, not merely as the commencement of a reform in a system radically evil, but as the dawn of a day that will close in the extirpation of the system itself.

ANDROPHILOS.

SIR,

IN my last (p. 137) I quoted a passage from Mr. Locke: and as it is always useful to point out the errors and inconsistencies of great men, that others may not be misled by them, I wish, with your leave, to say another word or two on the sentiment which is there expressed. Mr. Locke maintains that *all mankind* without the aid of revelation could have attained an *undoubting* conviction of the being of a God and a knowledge of the obedience which is due to him. When Mr. Locke expressed this opinion, he either could not have carefully considered what he meant by *all mankind*, or could not have had in his mind what he afterwards wrote on the existence of a God, which he regards as the most certain of all truth. Of this truth he gives a demonstration which no doubt he thought to be the most clear and simple. This demonstration, however, he acknowledges to be complex, when he says that "he believes nobody can avoid the cogency of it who will but as carefully attend to it as to any other demonstration of so many parts." Of

these parts, the first indeed is a proposition of which no man can doubt, but the rest consist of abstract and metaphysical reasoning. If your readers will turn to it, (Vol. II. p. 239 et seq.,) and then ask themselves whether the discovery of this demonstration is within the reach of a Hottentot or Indian savage, they will, I conceive, agree with me that even that truth which lies at the foundation of all religion, whether natural or revealed, is not so intelligible to *all mankind* as Mr. Locke has represented it; unless indeed they should fortunately hit upon some shorter and easier method of proof. But if the first principle of religion is involved in obscurity, as to multitudes of the human race, what shall we say of the whole system which is to be deduced from it? But Mr. Locke, as appears from what he says elsewhere, was misled by the opinion that it is inconsistent with the wisdom and goodness of God not to furnish all mankind with the means of knowing the great principles of religion. But surely we may leave in the hands of a merciful Creator those to whom these opportunities have been denied. If I have pointed out an error in Mr. Locke, I have done nothing but what this great and good man would have wished to be done, and, perhaps, nothing but what the light which he himself shed over the world of intellect has enabled me to do.

One word more, and I have done. If the advocates of Natural Religion would content themselves with saying, that its principles may be discovered by men of thought and reflection, and by their means be diffused among mankind in general, they would not run into palpable absurdity; but when they maintain that the truths of this religion, that is, the truths of which this religion is usually said to consist, are intelligible to every human being who will give himself the trouble to inquire into them, (which implies that every human being is capable of conducting such an inquiry,) they lay down a position which is not to be surpassed in extravagance by the wildest vagaries of the human mind—a position which it would be the extreme of folly willfully to *misstate*, and which it would be no easy task to *caricature*.

E. COGAN.

SIR, April 1st, 1824.

TO my remarks, (p. 110,) perhaps rather too unceremoniously expressed, on the Rev. Mr. Cogan's paper on the evidences of Christianity, that gentleman has replied, in your publication of this day, in a spirit of mildness and candour, which does him the highest honour, and which would greatly tend to increase, if that were possible, the respect with which his character is regarded by all who know him. I shall endeavour to follow his example, in the few observations I have to make on his reply.

Mr. Cogan appears to treat with great scorn the supposition, that men unacquainted with the Christian revelation, may believe in the unity and perfections of God, the doctrine of a universal Providence, and the future existence and immortality of man. He declares that he should not think favourably either of the understanding or the modesty of the man who should venture to say so; and he says, "If Mr. Sturch is disposed to believe that they would have had the conviction of their truth which they now have, had not their lot been cast in a Christian land, I can only say, that he has my hearty consent." Now, Sir, Mr. Cogan, who is much better acquainted with antiquity than I can be supposed to be, well knows, that all these doctrines have been believed before the Christian revelation had any existence. He knows too, that the belief of a Deity and a future life, though always more or less disfigured and debased by superstition and absurdity, has been very general, I might say universal, in all ages. He knows that these doctrines were believed by the heathen inhabitants of this island, in their rude and savage state; and it is for Mr. Cogan to shew, which I think he will find it difficult to do, that they would *not* have been generally believed to this day, whether Christianity had been introduced or not. For my own part, I see no reason whatever to doubt that they *would*; and, probably, in a much improved state, bearing some proportion to the civilization of the country. But if by the words, "*conviction of their truth which they now have*," Mr. Cogan means, the same clear, full, rational, and consistent in-

formation on these subjects, that we derive from the Christian revelation, I beg leave to assure him that no such supposition ever entered into my mind. For although I have no doubt whatever, that the light of nature opens to mankind in general the prospect of futurity; yet, I believe, that even to the strongest eyes, it must appear somewhat indistinct and imperfect; and I, therefore, rejoice in that splendid and glorious light, which the Christian revelation throws over the scene, and for which I can never be sufficiently thankful.

Mr. Cogan seems desirous of declining the task of pointing out to us, in whose writings it is that the truths of Natural Religion are spoken of as "*emblazoned in the heavens in characters which all can read, and none can misunderstand*." The only passage he quotes is from Locke, and he thinks it will answer his purpose tolerably well; but, I confess, I think quite otherwise; inasmuch as I can discover in it nothing more than the plain, simple position, that the light of nature is sufficient to convince *those who "set themselves to search,"* that there is a God to whom obedience is due; a position which, I presume, Mr. Cogan will not venture to deny, after having, in this very letter, on which I am remarking, told us, that he "*readily concedes to the advocates for Natural Religion, that the argument for the being of a God, is as conclusive as need be; and that from the predominance of good which appears in his works, it is difficult not to conceive of him as benevolent*." By the word God, I presume, he means a Creator and Governor of the world; and if this Creator and Governor is also a kind and benevolent Benefactor, Mr. Cogan will, doubtless, admit the conclusion to be very *natural*, that obedience is due to him. In a note on this quotation, Mr. Cogan goes on to say, "Mr. Locke speaks of *searching* for the truths of Natural Religion; and I never supposed any man to say, that they could be understood by those who would not *take the trouble* to learn them. *But that which is intelligible to all mankind, must be very easy to understand*." Now, from this position, I must beg leave to withhold my

assent. By *all mankind*, I suppose, we do not mean *every individual without exception*. We do not intend, for instance, to include *idiots*; but we mean mankind *in general*. Now, I think, I know many things, which mankind in general are very capable of learning and understanding, if they will *take the trouble* to do so, which yet cannot be said to be *very easy*. It can hardly be doubted, I suppose, that at least nine out of ten of mankind, if taken at a proper age, may be taught the chief rules of arithmetic; though these are so far from being *very easy*, that they are certainly far *more difficult* to understand than the leading principles of morals. Indeed, the very phrases "*take the trouble*," and "*set themselves to search*," plainly imply that all is not perfectly *easy*, but that there are some *difficulties* to be overcome by persevering labour; and I will add, *by all the assistance that the learner can obtain*. For I will not hesitate a moment to satisfy Mr. Cogan's curiosity, by answering in the affirmative the question which he suggests, but modestly doubts whether he has any right to put to me, concerning the propriety of calling in as often as it may be needful, the aid of some person of superior mind, to explain whatever may be obscure and difficult. I would, however, advise Mr. Cogan not to distress himself with fears, lest the instructor should shew something of the spirit of the usurping priest, of which I think there is little danger; for to repeat what I have elsewhere said, there is "this unspeakable advantage in favour of Natural Religion, that whoever undertakes to inculcate its pure and salutary maxims, is on a footing of perfect equality with his fellow-men." He can assume no dictatorial authority, nor exact from them any implicit obedience. As he cannot have the shadow of pretence for "dominion over their faith," he must content himself with being the "helper of their joy." In short, it appears to me that the quotations from Locke are extremely unfortunate, and not in any degree relevant to Mr. Cogan's purpose; and, as he has not produced any other authority to justify the use of the language to which I objected, I must consider his omit-

ting to do so, as a tacit admission, that if it was not the language of misstatement and caricature, it was, to say the least, *a little too strong*.

I proceed now to remark on the surprise which Mr. Cogan expresses at my objecting to his notion of the value of *belief without evidence*. He tells us he is *very sure* that it is true; and he maintains, "that there are multitudes in every Christian country who are *altogether* incapable of deciding on the truth or falsehood of the Christian religion." Now, if he means that there are multitudes who are incapable of deciding with certainty on the *external evidence* of Christianity, that is, of the truth of every miracle related in the New Testament, or in any writer of the earliest Christian age, I not only admit the truth of the position, but I go a great deal farther. I believe that there is not one man upon the face of the earth who is competent to the decision. But if his meaning be, that men in general have no adequate means of judging whether the important truths inculcated in the New Testament, are worthy to be received and acted upon, I must be allowed to differ from him *in toto*. For, being fully persuaded that Cicero was right in vindicating the authority of Right Reason in his book *De Republica*—that St. Paul was right in asserting the universal obligation of the Law of Nature in his *Epistle to the Romans*—that Bishop Sherlock was right in maintaining that "the religion of the gospel is the true original religion of Reason and Nature"—that Locke was right when he said, that "God had discovered to men the Unity and Majesty of his Eternal Godhead, and the truths of Natural Religion by the light of Reason"—that the learned and excellent Lardner was right in affirming "that St. Paul was not wont to *deny and contest*, but to improve, the natural notions which men had of religion"—that the Rev. Robert Robinson was right in saying, "a conformity between the dictates of Nature and the precepts of Revelation, is the *BEST PROOF* of the divinity of the latter"—and that Archdeacon Paley and a thousand others have been right in asserting the authority of both natural and supernatural revelation—and having

myself read the New Testament with care, and found it to consist principally of confirmation and illustration of Natural Religion, which, I am persuaded, men in general, being properly educated, are capable of understanding and justly appreciating; I deem it a libel on human nature to assert that mankind are incapable of judging for themselves, and that they must and ought to depend, for their religious ideas, on any dictatorial governor, whether ecclesiastical or civil.

Mr. Cogan, adverting to my profession of attachment both to Natural Religion and to Christianity, the latter of which, I have said, "*I verily believe to be true, the former, I certainly know to be so,*" imagines that he has discovered some difference of opinion on this subject, between me and the author of a book, entitled *Apeleutherus*; who, in speaking of a particular article of religious belief, says that *certainty* is entirely out of the question. And, as it is well known to Mr. Cogan, and to my friends in general, that the author of that book and myself, are, in reality, one and the same person, I must, of course, be sorry and ashamed, if there should be found to be any material difference between us. But I hope that a few words of explanation will shew, that the supposed difference is rather in appearance than in reality; and will satisfy both Mr. Cogan and another of your correspondents, whose signature is B, that they have both misunderstood my meaning. When I spoke of Natural Religion as *certainly* true, I should have thought it quite obvious that I was considering its general or abstract character, and not inquiring into the particulars of which it might be *supposed* to consist. And, undoubtedly, as a *general position* it may be safely affirmed, that whatever can be proved to be a principle of Natural Religion *must be true*; because the witnesses of this religion—the heavens which declare the glory of God—the firmament which sheweth his handy work—day unto day which uttereth speech—night unto night which sheweth knowledge—cannot for a moment be imagined to bear *false* testimony. But, with regard to the supposed particulars of this religion, the case is different. In considering

them, the question arises, What is the testimony that these witnesses give, and to what extent does it go? And, in some cases, the answer to this question may not be so clear and satisfactory as we could wish; probability may be the utmost that we can obtain—*certainty, in such cases, may be entirely out of the question.* With regard to Supernatural Religion, I have no hesitation in affirming, that it is always, in some degree, dependent upon things which are in their own nature fallacious; and, therefore, whether it be considered in the abstract, or in the detail of any particular revelation, *certainty must be always entirely out of the question.* It may still, however, possess a high degree of probability, and be entitled to be "*verily believed.*" If, therefore, Mr. Locke, in the passages quoted by Mr. Cogan, has really given Natural Religion "an advantage over the Bible," it was no great "fault;" and Mr. Cogan need not be very anxious to clear himself from the suspicion of being the accomplice of that illustrious man.

Notwithstanding my declaration of attachment both to natural and supernatural revelation, with, however, an undisguised preference of the *authority* of the former, I cannot admit the congratulatory statement of Mr. Cogan, that I have "the good fortune to possess *two religions.*" On the contrary, I am decidedly of opinion that there never was or can be more than one true and acceptable religion; which, as it has been well observed by my late learned and amiable friend, the Rev. Charles Bulkley, "being originally founded in the perfections of God, and the nature of man, must of necessity, in every period of time and under every particular dispensation of it, be fundamentally and essentially the same."

I now take leave of this controversy; regretting that it has been my painful duty to appear in opposition to the *opinions* of a gentleman whose personal character I so highly esteem; and, thanking you, Sir, for permitting me to occupy so much space in the pages of your valuable Miscellany.

WILLIAM STURCH.

Mr. Wallace's Remarks on Isaiah ix. 6, 7.

No. III.

IN my former remarks, (pp. 21—24 and pp. 94—97,) upon the celebrated prophecy contained in Isaiah ix. 6, 7, I endeavoured, first, to resolve the chronological difficulty which had prevented its application to King Hezekiah. I then suggested what appeared to me the most probable translation of the passage, and intimated an intention to point out, on some future occasion, the circumstances which appeared to confine the application of it exclusively to Hezekiah. In fulfilling this intention, I am aware that I shall have no very easy task to accomplish; but I am encouraged to proceed by the hope of throwing some light upon a subject which, in my opinion, has hitherto been involved in great obscurity.

The following is Lowth's introductory outline of the subject of this prophecy.

"The confederacy of Retsin, King of Syria, and Pekah, King of Israel, against the kingdom of Judah, was formed in the time of Jotham; and, perhaps, the effects of it were felt in the latter part of his reign: see 2 Kings xv. 37, and note on chap. i. 7—9. However, in the very beginning of the reign of Ahaz, they jointly invaded Judah with a powerful army, and threatened to destroy, or to dethrone, the House of David. The king and royal family being in the utmost consternation on receiving advices of their designs, Isaiah is sent to them to support and comfort them in their present distress, by assuring them, that God would make good his promises to David and his House. This makes the subject of this, and the following, and the beginning of the ninth chapters; in which there are many and great difficulties."

Taking this to be, on the whole, a fair representation of the circumstances under which the prophecy was delivered, I proceed to examine that part of it which it is my present intention to illustrate; and, in doing this, I must entreat the reader to go back with me to the beginning of the chapter.

"The people that walked in darkness, have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow

of death, upon them hath the light shined:" ver. 2. The darkness here mentioned is supposed by Grotius to represent the dangers with which Jerusalem was threatened by its enemies, and the light, the unexpected deliverance which took place on the destruction of Sennacherib's army. "Populus Hierosolymitanus in gravissimis constitutus periculis, quæ tenebrarum nomine appellant Hebræi. Experietur egregiam liberationem, cæso Divinitus Sennacheribi tam valido exercitu."

"Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy: they joy before thee, according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil:" ver. 3. Lowth substitutes ל for the negative particle א, on the authority of eleven manuscripts and the Keri, and Dodson adopts this amended reading: "Thou hast multiplied the nation: thou hast increased their joy:" the joy occasioned by the miraculous overthrow of Sennacherib's army.

"For thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor, as in the day of Midian:" ver. 4. Whatever may be thought of the phrases, "walked in darkness," and "have seen a great light," and of the application of that part of the prophecy in an accommodated sense, (Mal. iv. 15, 16,) to the blessings diffused by the gospel, there can be no doubt, I think, as to the meaning of such expressions as "the yoke of his burden," "the staff of his shoulder," and "the rod of his oppressor." It was obviously the intention of the prophet to point out the dangers which threatened the Jewish nation at that particular period, and the manner in which it was to be delivered from those dangers.

"For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood: but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire:" ver. 5. These words are thus paraphrased by Grotius: "Aliæ clades hostium solent parari multo labore multoque sanguine; hæc verò similis erit incendio subito consument. Planè enim subito, sine tumultu, sine vulnere, sine Hebræorum labore aut periculo, ab angelo extincti sunt Assyrii. Nulla flamma tam celeriter eos occidere potuisset." Other defeats are usually

attended with the sacrifice of much labour and blood; but this shall be like a fire which suddenly consumes. For suddenly, without tumult, without loss, without either labour or danger on the part of the Hebrews, the Assyrians shall be consumed by an angel. No flame could so quickly destroy them.

The prophet now goes on to point out the illustrious monarch, in whose reign this miraculous deliverance is to take place.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder:" ver. 6. The birth of a male child is here foretold, and that child heir to the throne of David. His royal descent is sufficiently indicated by the assurance that "the government shall be upon his shoulder."

"And his name shall be called —" He shall be —? This mode of expression is sometimes used by Latin and Greek, as well as Hebrew writers, merely to denote the character or quality of a person or thing. See the Note to Monk's Hippolytus, ver. 2, with the reference to Porson. See also Heyne's Note to Virgil, Georg. II. 238; and for examples in the Old Testament, see Gen. v. 2; Deut. xxv. 10; Isa. lxi. 3; Jer. xi. 16, &c. In the present case it may denote that the epithets which follow are to be applied as titles of distinction to the person who forms the subject of the prophecy.

"Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, —" In "The Monthly Repository" for February I endeavoured to shew that these words are improperly translated in our common Bibles, and that they ought to have been rendered "Wonderful in Counsel, a Mighty God;" taking the word מְלֵךְ in the inferior sense in which it must always be taken, when applied to any being except the great Supreme. To justify this interpretation of the word מְלֵךְ, I must here request the reader to turn to Ezek. xxxii. 21, where he will find it used in the plural number, in a state of regimen with גְּבוּרִים. "The strong among the mighty," literally, "the Gods of the mighty," (אֱלֹהֵי גְבוּרִים), Heb. אֱלֹהֵי גְבוּרִים, Vat. potentissimi robustorum, Vulg.) "shall speak to him out of the midst of hell." The persons of whom these words are de-

scriptive are the deceased monarchs of the earth, whom the prophet represents as in the act of addressing Pharaoh on his descent into the regions of the grave. The whole of the passage bears a very strong resemblance to the fourteenth chapter of Isaiah, in which the destruction of Babylon is foretold, and a fine picture is drawn of the reception of its monarch by his brother rulers in the unseen world. "Hell from beneath is moved to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth: it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations." Isa. xiv. 9.— On comparing these two passages, it will be found that the persons who are styled, by the prophet Ezekiel, "Gods of the Mighty," are no other than an assemblage of deceased monarchs. Surely, then, it need not excite our surprise that another Jewish prophet should apply to King Hezekiah, who was, next to David, the most illustrious and favourite monarch of the Jews, an epithet which is thus indiscriminately extended to the deceased rulers of Heathen nations. "I am fully satisfied," says Dr. Carpenter, "that these magnificent titles would produce no such impressions, as are now received from them, in the minds of those who early understood the original, and were familiar, from childhood, with the language of eastern magnificence. We have it from authentic records, that among the kings of Syria, about two centuries before Christ, the appellation *God* was commonly employed as a kind of surname of their kings. Among other instances, we find that in the year 172 before Christ, the Samaritans sent an embassy to Antiochus, with this inscription, 'To King Antiochus, Illustrious God.'—In like manner we meet with these titles of Chosroes, a Persian monarch, about six centuries after Christ: 'Chosroes, King of Kings, Ruler of the powerful, Lord of the nations, Sovereign of peace, Saviour of men; among the Gods a good and eternal man, among men a most illustrious God; Glorious; Conqueror,' &c. Could persons, accustomed to such appellations and epithets of princes, have considered even the appellation of *Mighty God*, (when applied to one who was to be born, whose go-

vernment the Lord of hosts would establish,) as denoting more, than that the dignified personage would be a Mighty Potentate, an Illustrious Sovereign?" (Isaiah's Prophetic Titles of the Messiah, a Discourse by Lant Carpenter, LL.D., pp. 26, 27.) To this question only one answer can be given; and, on the supposition that this appellation was intended to be descriptive of Jesus Christ, the argument of Dr. Carpenter appears to me conclusive and unanswerable. But, as far as I can perceive, we are not justified in applying the titles contained in this prophecy to any other person than King Hezekiah; and in the application of them to him there is a peculiar propriety, to which the historical writers of the Old Testament appear to me to have been minutely attentive. When the King of Assyria sends Tartan, and Rabсарis, and Rabshakeh, with a numerous army against Jerusalem, the last of these persons, in an interview with three of Hezekiah's "most intimate friends," breaks out into the following strain of invective: "Speak ye now to Hezekiah, Thus saith the great King, the King of Assyria, What confidence is this wherein thou trustest? Thou sayest, (but they are but vain words,) I have COUNSEL and MIGHT for the war: now on whom dost thou trust, that thou rebellest against me?" 2 Kings xviii. 19, 20. (See likewise xx. 20; 2 Chron. xxxii. 3—8, 23.) Here there appears to me a marked allusion to the leading titles contained in Isaiah's prophecy. The words עֲצָה וְגִבּוֹרָה, *Counsel and Might*, plainly refer, in my opinion, to the epithets עֲצָה [or, יִצְחָק] פֶּלֶא and גִּבּוֹר, "Wonderful in Counsel, a Mighty God." That the Assyrian monarch was no stranger to these titles I can readily believe. Indeed, there is a passage found in a Jewish writing, quoted by Rammohun Roy, (The Precepts of Jesus, &c., 2nd ed., p. 315,) from which it appears that this monarch actually appropriated to himself epithets similar to those which the prophet applied to Hezekiah. "God said, Let Hezekiah, who has five names, take vengeance upon the King of Assyria, who has taken upon himself five names also. Talmud Sanhedrim, ch. xi."

"*Everlasting Father*, —" *Father of the age*.—What language could have conveyed a more appropriate description of a monarch like Hezekiah than this? To say of a king that he is "the father of his age," is to speak of him in terms of the greatest endearment, as well as the highest encomium; and, if Hezekiah is not literally so called by any of those historians who have so briefly recorded the events of his reign, every qualification necessary to secure to a monarch this enviable title is ascribed to him. He repaired the temple of God, restored the religion of his forefathers in all its original purity and splendour, broke in pieces the idols which had been erected to Heathen gods during the reigns of his predecessors, cut down their groves and destroyed their temples. Under his mild and paternal administration Jerusalem recovered all its former prosperity, and so great was the success with which all his undertakings were crowned, that he is again and again said to have "prospered in all his works." 2 Kings xviii. 7; 2 Chron. xxxi. 21, xxxii. 27—30.

"*Prince of Peace*." This completes the climax of the prophet, and forms the finishing stroke to his description of Hezekiah's illustrious character; whose reign is uniformly spoken of as a peaceful and happy one. This will appear the more remarkable if we consider the times in which he lived, and the enemies with which he had to contend. "The great King," as Sennacherib is called, in Herodotus and Josephus, as well as in the Old Testament, notwithstanding all his formidable preparations against Jerusalem, was compelled to flee with a small remnant of his army to Nineveh, after an ineffectual attempt to reduce the kingdom of Judah into a state of subjection; and when the same prophet who foretold the birth and future greatness of Hezekiah, announced the approaching calamities of his people, and their ultimate captivity, this was his memorable reply: "Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken. Is it not good, if peace and truth be in my days?" 2 Kings xx. 19. In summing up the character of this monarch, the author

of the second book of Kings says, that "after him was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him;" ch. xviii. 5; and, such was the respect in which his memory was held, that "he was buried in the *chief* of the sepulchres of the sons of David, and all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem did him honour at his death" 2 Chron. xxxii. 33.

The prophet now proceeds to enlarge upon the glory of Hezekiah's reign in terms of the most animated description: "*Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth, even for ever:*" ver. 7. Here, it will be observed, the person spoken of is described as sitting upon David's throne, inheriting his kingdom, and dispensing judgment with justice: language which applies in a peculiarly forcible manner to Hezekiah. It is said likewise, that "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end;" the meaning of which I take to be this: that his reign will be protracted to an unusual length, that it will be, on the whole, peaceable, and that there will be no end to the *increase* of his government till the period of his death. To justify this interpretation I shall enter into no minute and laboured criticism, but content myself with quoting one or two passages of Scripture, in which similar phraseology occurs. "There is one alone, and there is not a second; yea, he hath neither child nor brother, yet there is *no end* of all his labour;" (Eccles. iv. 8;) no end of it but with the termination of his life. "Their land is full of silver and gold, *neither is there any end* of their treasures." (Isa. ii. 7.) These treasures could not have been absolutely inexhaustible. There must have been some end to them, however abundant. To the same purpose see Eccles. iv. 16; Nahum ii. 9, iii. 3. But apply these words, as they are usually applied, to Jesus Christ, and in the orthodox sense. Is the kingdom which he has received from the Father to have no end? Is the period never to arrive

when it must be resigned into the hands of him who gave it? The apostle Paul, who was no stranger to the nature of Christ's kingdom, shall resolve these questions in his own words: "Then cometh *the end*, when *he shall have delivered up the kingdom to GOD*, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power.—And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that GOD may be *ALL IN ALL.*" 1 Cor. xv. 24. 28.

Having now, as I hope, satisfactorily shewn that the terms of this celebrated prophecy were strictly fulfilled in the person of Hezekiah, I will briefly state the grounds on which I venture to pronounce it totally inapplicable to Jesus Christ. Grotius, and other learned commentators, finding that many of the prophecies supposed to relate to the Messiah had an obvious reference to eminent individuals who existed long before the time of Jesus, and wishing, at the same time, to retain in its full force the argument in favour of Christianity deduced from the prophecies of the Old Testament, had recourse to the theory of a double sense. Lowth availed himself of the same ingenious contrivance in the notes to his Translation of Isaiah; and sanctioned by his authority and example this double dealing with the Scriptures of eternal truth. Whiston, with characteristic ingenuousness, opposed this theory, and contended that "the prophecies of the Old Testament, at all appertaining to the Messiah, particularly those which are quoted as testimonies and arguments in the New Testament, do properly and solely belong to the Messiah, and do not at all concern any other person;" and Dr. Benson, in his "Essay concerning the Unity of Sense," made it his professed object "to shew that no text of scripture has more than one single sense." In accomplishing this object, the last-mentioned writer appears to me to have been eminently successful; and, although I cannot always agree with him in the application of his own principles, to the correctness of those principles themselves I cordially and unhesitatingly

subscribe. "We justly condemn the answers of the Heathen oracles," says he, "as riddles, dark and obscure, vague and indeterminate, capable of being turned many ways, without certainly knowing which sense was intended, or in what way they are to be understood. But divine prophecies should be intelligible, and have one determinate meaning; that it may be known when and how they are accomplished.—We admire it as an excellence in Homer, and other celebrated writers of antiquity, that their meaning is expressed clearly; and may not we expect, when God speaks to men, that his meaning should be expressed in as clear and determinate a manner?—In one word, if the Scriptures are not to be interpreted, like the best ancient authors, in their one, true and genuine meaning, the common people will be led to doubt, whether or no the Scriptures have any certain meaning at all. They will be for ever at a loss what to believe, and what to practise, upon what to ground their comfort here, and their hope of salvation hereafter."

This subject is one among many to which Unitarians have not yet devoted so much attention as its importance demands. Nothing would give me more sincere pleasure than to see it fairly and candidly discussed in the pages of the Monthly Repository. It was on this very ground that Collins made his grand attack upon Christianity; and I lament to say that, among the numerous writers who professed to answer his arguments, I have hitherto met with none, who has entered fully into the merits of this important controversy.

R. WALLACE.

SIR,

IN your number for January last, (pp. 29, 30,) a correspondent, under the signature of *An Old Subscriber*, observes, that "the Editors of the British Critic, in their Review for October last, confess that the Genealogies of Christ given by Matthew and Luke, is a subject enumbered with many difficulties," and that they "observe, it is best reconciled by supposing that Matthew traces Christ's

legal descent from David through Joseph, and that Luke traces Christ's real descent from David through his maternal line." And your correspondent recommends to the Editors the perusal of Mr. Gorton's Solution of the Grand Scriptural Puzzle, the Genealogy of Jesus; for, says he, if it "be correct, there is at once an end of every difficulty on the subject." What these difficulties are, and what is the subject of them, your correspondent has left his readers to guess; but by a reference to Mr. Gorton's Work, it will be seen that its object is to expunge from the New Testament the narratives contained in the introductory chapters of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which describe the conception of the Virgin Mary to be miraculous, and, as a consequence, he rejects the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. So important and decisive does your correspondent consider Mr. Gorton's Work, that he expresses his surprise that no notice is taken of it by the Editors of the British Critic in their Review of "the seventh article in the number for October last," as their particular attention was called to it in July.

The simple fact is, that the Reviewer has adopted that explanation of the Genealogies which is given by the author of the work which he was then reviewing, entitled, *A Vindication of the Authenticity of the Narratives contained in the first two Chapters of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, being an Investigation of Objections urged by the Unitarian Editors of the Improved Version of the New Testament, with an Appendix, containing Strictures on the Variations between the First and Fourth Editions of that Work*. As the limits of the Reviewer did not allow of the introduction of the arguments by which his own solution of the difficulty was supported, it was not to be expected that he would travel out of his way to notice the objections of an opponent, whose work was not regularly before him. Whether Christ was miraculously conceived or not, the explanation of the Genealogical Tables, as given by the author of the *Vindication*, appears to me the most rational, and the best supported by evidence of any

that I have seen. I shall not unnecessarily occupy your pages by discussing the comparative merits of the different explanations of the Genealogies, but refer your readers to pp. 123 to 139 of the *Vindication*, and to Mr. Gorton's Work; or the superficial manner in which the latter has conducted his arguments, and the unsatisfactory nature of his conclusions might easily be pointed out.

Mr. Wright's Essay on the Miraculous Conception, and a work by Rammohun Roy, are also referred to by your correspondent. An answer to every thing that is argumentative in Mr. Wright's Essay, will be found in the *Vindication*. With respect to Rammohun Roy it will suffice to observe, that I should place more confidence in the Evangelist Matthew's application of the prophecy of Isaiah, ch. vii. 14, as given in the first chapter of his Gospel, than in that of Rammohun Roy. If it be objected that I should first prove that Matthew was the author of the passage to which I refer, I answer, that this has been already done by the author of the *Vindication*.

An Old Subscriber could scarcely be serious when he supposes that the Reviewer of the *Vindication* did not allude to Mr. Gorton's Work, from an idea that it is incontrovertible, and consequently "from a desire not to give publicity to a publication that at once overturns this portion of the fabric of orthodoxy," as he sarcastically terms it; he, however, leaves the reader to discover what "portion of the fabric" it is to which he alludes: if he mean the first two chapters of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, I can assure him that the Editor of the *British Critic* is under no more apprehension of those portions of the sacred text of the New Testament being overturned by any efforts of Mr. Gorton, than of the remainder of the Sacred Volume, through the imbecile attacks of the Deist. This must have been discovered by your correspondent, had he looked beyond that part of the Review which he has cited; for the Reviewer, with Mr. Gorton's Work

before him, (if your correspondent's statement be correct,) says of the *Vindication*—"Every objection to the first two chapters of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke is solidly refuted, and the evidence in favour of their genuineness and authenticity is stated with the utmost clearness and force. The work is written in a spirit of candour and fairness—and we regard it as an ample and most convincing vindication of the disputed chapters," and the Reviewer further expresses his opinion, that it is impossible to refute it! Whether the work itself merits this character, can only be determined by a perusal of it, which is therefore recommended to your readers, that they may judge for themselves, and not be improperly influenced by the opinions of others, whether friends or enemies of the cause espoused by the author of the *Vindication*.

Z. N.

London,

April 23, 1824.

SIR,

I WILL thank you, or any correspondent of yours, to inform me, through the medium of the Repository, whether Mr. Gorton's work, relative to the Genealogy of Jesus, has been noticed in any of the Reviews opposed to the Unitarian doctrine; and if it has, I shall be glad to be informed of the title of the Review, and the period of its publication.

Not recollecting to have met with any remarks in support of Mr. Gorton's statement—that it was formerly customary among the Jews to denominate, on the female side, the grandson the son; and, by the same rule, to term the grandfather the father—I shall be thankful to any of your learned correspondents, who may be pleased to state their information on this very interesting subject. For, if such a custom formerly existed, the Genealogies, as expressed in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, perfectly accord in shewing, that Joseph was the real and legitimate father of Jesus.

AN OLD SUBSCRIBER.

REVIEW.

"Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."—POPE.

ART. I.—*A Memoir of the Rev. T. N. Toller.* By Robert Hall, M. A. London. Published by Holdsworth. 8vo. pp. 71. 1824.

[Concluded from p. 179.]

IT may generally be expected, and indeed is not a little desirable, that a biographer shall feel a cordial interest in the subject of his memoir. At the same time, he comes under a literary, and even a moral, obligation to abstain from needless, irrelevant and ill-considered digressions: nor should he so mingle his own prejudices and attachments, his own passions and opinions, with the events which he records, as to interrupt the current of his narrative. Let our readers determine, whether, in the following paragraphs, this caution has been exercised:

"—at the time of Mr. Toller's admission into the Daventry Academy, the literary reputation of that seminary was higher than that of any among the Dissenters: but partly owing to a laxness in the terms of admission, and partly to the admixture of lay and divinity students, combined with the mode in which theology was taught, erroneous principles prevailed much; and the majority of such as were educated there, became more distinguished for their learning than for the fervour of their piety, or the purity of their doctrine. The celebrated Priestley speaks of the state of the academy, while he resided there, with great complacency: nothing, he assures us, could be more favourable to the progress of free inquiry; since both the tutors and students were about equally divided between the Orthodox and Arian systems. The arguments by which every possible modification of error is attempted to be supported, were carefully marshalled in hostile array against the principles generally embraced; while the Theological Professor prided himself on the steady impartiality with which he held the balance betwixt the contending systems, seldom or never interposing his own opinion, and still less betraying the slightest emotion of antipathy to error, or predilection to truth. Thus a spirit of indifference to all religious principles was generated in the first instance, which naturally paved the way for the prompt reception of doctrines indulgent to the

corruption and flattering to the pride of a depraved and fallen nature.

"To affirm that Mr. Toller derived no injury from being exposed at so tender an age to this vortex of unsanctified speculation and debate, would be affirming too much; since it probably gave rise to a certain general manner of stating the peculiar doctrines of the gospel which attached chiefly to the earlier part of his ministry; though it is equally certain that his mind, even when he left the academy, was so far imbued with the grand peculiarities of the gospel, that he never allowed himself to lose sight of the doctrine of the cross, as the only basis of human hope."—Pp. 4—6.

It is not often that in the same number of sentences we meet with so much inaccuracy of statement and conclusion.

"The literary reputation" of "the Daventry Academy, at the time of Mr. Toller's admission," was *not* "higher than that of any among the Dissenters:" it was inferior to the reputation of Warrington.* Truth and candour require this concession. "In the course of our academical studies," writes the celebrated Priestley, "there was then no provision made for teaching the learned languages. Our course of lectures was also defective in containing no lectures on the Scriptures, or on ecclesiastical history."† After Dr. Ashworth had presided, for a few years, over the academy, these defects were, in a certain degree, remedied; so that its "literary reputation" was, no doubt, better, "at the time of Mr. Toller's admission." Even, however, at that period, it was not such as to warrant the unqualified encomium passed by the biographer. If languages and science form the constituent branches of a *literary*, or learned, education, the fame of Daventry must be placed on other ground. The institution was not, so far, pre-eminent even among Dissenting academies: we

* See the instructive account of the *Warrington Academy*, in the Eighth and Ninth Volume of the *Monthly Repository*.

† *Memoirs of Dr. Priestley*. Written by himself. 8vo. Vol. I. p. 21.

must again say, that, in these respects, it was surpassed by Warrington, if not by the seminary which Coward's Trustees maintained at Hoxton. Of Daventry the noble and almost unrivalled distinction was, that Theology, Metaphysics and Ethics, (and what studies so important?) were taught most accurately and laboriously, and with that impartiality which is honoured by Mr. Hall's censures and comminations. As the consequence, a large portion of valuable knowledge was communicated to the pupils, whose industry* in availing themselves of their advantages, and whose firmness and charity in professing what they severally esteemed as truth, have rarely been surpassed.

But the author of the memoir assumes the existence of "a laxness in the terms of admission" at the Daventry Academy, and is desirous of tracing back to this cause an effect alike imaginary. Was "Mr. Toller's admission" owing to such "a laxness"? Clearly not: and we will venture to declare, that in the majority of other instances the charge cannot be substantiated. Most of the students did credit to their profession, their patrons and their tutors. To say that *all* were of this character, "would be affirming too much:" but where is the seminary, in which no such exceptions have been found?

In Mr. Hall's judgment, the effect, that he assumes, was further owing "partly to the admixture of lay and divinity students." Had he reasoned on this fact, his arguments should have been met with arguments: but he contents himself with assertion: to which therefore our own shall be opposed. We passed four happy years in the Academy at Daventry: during that term, the number of its pupils was larger than at any former period: and with its history we are not perhaps less conversant than the biographer of Mr. Toller. Now we scruple not to say, that, taken altogether, the admixture of lay and divinity students was extremely serviceable to

individual character, to religious principle, and to the interests of Protestant Nonconformity. Such, moreover, it has been in two Dissenting colleges besides, with which our experience and observation have brought us acquainted. It is true, no human arrangements can be completely successful, no human advantages, perfectly unalloyed: and, here again, it "would be affirming too much" to maintain that in a few cases real inconvenience and evil did not result from the connexion. What we mean to declare, advisedly and distinctly, is, that in the great majority of instances the admixture was a mutual and a solid benefit, that, as the consequence, nearly all the lay students evinced, through future life, an enlightened, a cordial, and honourable attachment to the Dissenting cause, while the divinity students found in that class of the pupils whom Mr. H. proscribes, many virtuous and steady friends, not only of their youth, but of their succeeding years.* Whither indeed shall the sons of wealthy, and, let us add, of consistent Nonconformists be sent for the higher branches of education; where shall they enjoy the benefits of such instruction, combined with domestic vigilance, if they be excluded from seminaries, which, at the same time, receive candidates for the ministry? The admixture existed long before the Academy at Daventry; long before the days of Jennings and of Doddridge—and was never regarded, by well-informed men, as unfavourable either to fervour of piety or to purity of doctrine.†

Mr. T.'s Biographer goes on to complain of "the mode in which theology was taught" at Daventry. The tutor in that department, it seems, did not impose his own opinions upon his pupils: and hence, according to the writer before us, "erroneous principles prevailed much." If this was really the case, we must exclaim, "Effect unhappy from a noble cause!"

* One such beloved, honoured friend the writer of the present article found pre-eminently in the late Saml. Pett, M.D.

"—— gratâ semper quem mente recordor."

† Kippis's Life of Doddridge, pp. lxxi. lxxii.

* When the writer of this article entered the Academy at Daventry, Mr. Robins, who had for some years, retired from his office in it, observed to him, that "perhaps in no seminary was business more regularly and steadily pursued."

It is not, however, the *ipse dixit* of even Mr. Hall, which can convert Truth into Error, or Error into Truth. Let him demonstrate, if he is able, that freedom of inquiry and impartiality of instruction produce evil fruits, that they issue in consequences generally and extensively pernicious. In the mean time, it may be useful to look back on "the mode in which theology was" actually "taught" at Hinckley, by Mr. Jennings, at Northampton, by Dr. Doddridge, and at Daventry, by Dr. Ashworth and his successors.

With "the course of lectures" delivered by the second of the individuals whom we have mentioned, a large portion of the public is familiar. This work, even if it possessed no other recommendation than the copiousness of its references, would richly deserve a place in every theological library. Nevertheless, sufficient attention does not appear to have been bestowed by the generality of readers, on the circumstances of its origin, form and tendency. The plan and the materials, were not altogether those of Doddridge, whose tutor, the Rev. John Jennings, of Hinckley, had drawn up, in Latin, a work of the same kind, in manuscript, from which the mathematical form of "the course of lectures," &c. was taken, and from which, too, some of the propositions and demonstrations, especially in the former part, were borrowed.* The method, though extremely curious, has not quite so friendly an aspect on free investigation as Mr. H. imagines. *Both sides of a question*—the orthodox and the heretical—are indeed discussed: but in what manner? Current and popular doctrines, form the subjects of the *propositions*, or of what may be styled the leading articles; while those which Mr. H. would stigmatize as "erroneous," are consigned to *scholia*, &c., and thus marked as subordinate, in point of claims and evidence. It is the slightest objection to Doddridge's Lectures, that they exhibit the shadow of mathematical proof, without any approach to the reality: a far more serious evil is, that to generally-received tenets

they give the prominence which we have described, and by this means produce or cherish undue prepossessions and prejudices in the student's mind. On the other hand, the multitude and fairness of the references to books, may be stated as a counter-acting cause, as favourable to the exercise of an honest judgment; though it be a cause which operates far more slowly than that to which it is opposed. Certain it is, and we acknowledge with lively gratitude and satisfaction, that, notwithstanding Coward, the patron of the academy, was excessively devoted to human creeds, and notwithstanding the arrangement of the theological lectures was singularly well calculated to recommend his own articles of faith, INQUIRY received encouragement, and found an ample field in which to exercise itself. This encouragement it obtained from Doddridge, in whom Orthodoxy (so men call it) was united with charity, and of whose temper, integrity and good sense in his habits of lecturing, our readers will better judge, when we have placed before them a few sentences from the memoirs of him by Orton:*

Speaking of Dr. D.'s pupils, that biographer says,

"He never expected nor desired, that they should blindly follow his sentiments, but permitted and encouraged them to *judge for themselves*. To assist them herein, he laid before them what he apprehended to be the Truth with all perspicuity, and impartially stated all objections to it. He never concealed the difficulties which affected any question, but referred them to writers on both sides, without hiding any from their inspection. He frequently and warmly urged them, not to take their system of divinity from any *man* or *body of men*, but from the word of God. The BIBLE was always referred and appealed to, upon every point in question, to which it could be supposed to give any light."

Free inquiry after truth, characterised, accordingly, most of Dr. Doddridge's pupils; and, whatever sentiments they embraced, they exer-

* See the Editor's (the Rev. S. Clark) Advertisement to the original edition.

* P. 86, 2nd edit. and Kippis's Life of Doddridge, pp. lx. lxvii. How widely does the opinion of these valuable biographers differ from Mr. H.'s, on the subject of a theological tutor's duty!

eised unaffected candour.* The lectures of that eminent man, first in manuscript and afterwards in print, continued to be the text-book in the academy; and the opinions of the respective divinity tutors, down to the year 1789,† were Calvinistic; while the abilities, the assiduity, the worth and manners of those gentlemen, were singularly calculated to prepossess the students in behalf of prevailing and established creeds. In such circumstances was not the triumph of orthodoxy to be most securely and confidently expected? What could be wanting to ensure its victories? Why, the tutors were enlightened and consistent Protestants, and, therefore, did not forbid impartial, unbiassed investigation. *Hinc illæ lacrimæ*: hence “the erroneous opinions,” which Mr. H. fancies and laments.

Now will he maintain the converse of the proposition, which he has virtually laid down? Will he affirm or intimate that Truth cannot be embraced by the pupil, unless he read upon only one, and that the reputedly orthodox side of the question, unless the tutor *interpose* his own sentiments, nor hold the balance “betwixt the contending systems” with “steady impartiality”? Mr. H.’s principle and reasoning, if they be correct, lead to this conclusion, which, once admitted, is fatal to his cause, in the eyes of all who believe that the BIBLE, interpreted by itself, is the religion of Protestants.

The *mode* of teaching theology at Daventry, was, for the most part, inauspicious to free examination; and this, as the tendency of the structure and arrangement of Doddridge’s lectures to bring orthodox sentiments into fuller view than any other tenets. But the *spirit* of the tutors was such as we have described it, fair, manly and truly liberal: it graced their characters, endeared their labours, and will contribute to embalm their memories. The venerable survivor of them, within the two or three last years of his connexion with the Academy, introduced an elaborate and a far more impartial plan of lecturing

on a much controverted doctrine. For the nature and the effects of this consistent endeavour to do justice to *both sides of the question*, we shall make a reference to some of his own writings.* It was an obvious and a great improvement on the text-book, that hitherto had been employed with very little reserve. However, a still more excellent—we must indeed subjoin, the most excellent—method of teaching the doctrines of the Scriptures, is *the critical study of the original Scriptures themselves*. Not that it constitutes the whole of a theological education: but then the theological education which does not include it, will be wretchedly superficial and incomplete. We cannot be satisfied with any *mode* of teaching divinity, which comes short of this: and we hail the existence of an academical institution among us, which illustrates the practicability and the advantages of lectures that are exclusively scriptural † What is styled the religious world, will never become thoroughly Protestant and Christian, until the Records of Revelation are investigated by the light which themselves afford and reflect; and not by systems which men have previously framed.

Mr. H. calls the Academy at Daventry “this vortex of unsanctified speculation and debate.” Does he mean to assert or insinuate, that the students pursued their inquiries with an irreligious spirit? In this and in every sense, his accusation falls pointless to the ground: and, in his cooler moments, he will surely blush, that it was framed by his prejudices and recorded by his pen. Perhaps, there was, after all, less of speculation and debate than our biographer’s imagination has conceived. Be this as it may; we deny that they were “unsanctified.” The greater proportion of the students, were far from being remiss in cherishing *religious* habits: the prescribed allotments of their time, and the voluntary societies which they instituted, aided those habits: and who among the pupils at Daventry can look back on the *devotional lec-*

* See Mr. Robins’ very pleasing and instructive Memoirs of Strange, pp. xxiii. xxiv.

† Belsham’s Calm Inq., &c.

* Belsham’s Memoirs of Lindsey, p. 286, &c. Calm Inq., &c. Preface.

† Mon. Repos. XI. 406, 407; and see Dr. J. Jebb’s Works, Vol. I. 1; Vol. II. 237, &c.

tures* that were periodically delivered, without warmly grateful recollections, without justly and humbly ascribing to them *instrumentally*, if not the existence at least the strength and *ferour* of qualities which he would not exchange for "the wealth of Orinus or of Ind"? Even this gentleman's sense of equity and candour, must compel him to acknowledge, that the instructions and the discipline of Daventry possessed a share in forming the moral and religious character of Mr. Toller. That character was indeed most estimable and lovely; a charming portrait of "the wisdom that is from above." No vulgar orthodoxy was ever concerned in producing such a temper: and we are persuaded that this excellent person owed something more and higher than "a certain general manner of stating the peculiar doctrines of the gospel" to the seminary where he passed so important a portion of his *early* life. "At so tender an age," he must have been susceptible of good as well as of *injurious* impressions. His biographer can hardly be of opinion, that ignorance is the mother of devotion, that sincere and free investigation is in the inverse ratio of a man's piety. Yet, if we knew Mr. H. only from some passages of the Memoir before us, we might infer that such is his conviction.

He employs grossly exaggerated language, when he states, that the tutor who presided at Daventry seldom or never interposed his own opinion, and still less betrayed the slightest emotion of antipathy to error, or predilection to truth. In this instance, again, the testimony of the celebrated Priestley confronts him: "Dr. Ashworth," says that great man, "was earnestly desirous to make me as orthodox as possible."† Mr. H. should have relieved us from the painful necessity of transcribing this sentence: but the partial uses to which he has applied Priestley's narrative, and the colour he has given it, are extremely censurable; and we are constrained to pronounce, that this gentleman seems little careful of the means by which he accomplishes his design: he

accuses, but does not inquire; he *strikes*, but will not *hear*.

From statements of which we have proved the incorrectness he arrives at the following conclusion:

"Thus a spirit of indifference to all religious principles was generated in the first instance, which naturally paved the way for the prompt reception of doctrines indulgent to the corruption and flattering to the pride of a depraved and fallen nature."

Had the biographer described "a spirit of indifference to all religious *principle*," as producing this supposed effect, we should have understood his argument, while we remonstrated against his application of it to the students in the Academy at Daventry. By his selection of the words "religious principles," he must evidently mean to fix the attention of his readers on the *theological opinions* which divide the Christian world. His language is somewhat ambiguous: but the connexion in which it stands, explains it; and nothing can be more solid or important than the distinction that we have taken. Let all our inquiries into the tenets of religion, be pursued in the spirit, and in the exercise of the *principle*, of religion: to the systems and formularies of men, however, to such religious *principles*, if indeed they should be so denominated, as are embraced previously to a critical examination of the Scriptures, and independently on it, let the mind of the pupil be perfectly indifferent, when he sits down to the study of prophets, evangelists and apostles. This is the duty, the privilege, of those who "name the name of Christ." Mr. H.'s remarks imply that the youth who discharges this obligation can scarcely fail of adopting "erroneous opinions," or, in other words, Anti-Trinitarian and Anti-Calvinistic sentiments. Such is the *datum* which his observations assume; such the conclusion, to which they lead. We cannot and will not disturb him in the possession of this belief.

But against his eminently unjust and uncharitable intimation, that the doctrines of which he speaks as being so promptly received are indulgent to the corruption and flattering to the pride of a depraved and fallen nature,

* For some account of them see Orton's Mem. of Doddridge, p. 97.

† Memoirs, &c. p. 10.

we most seriously protest. For his own sake, we particularly wish that this sentence had not fallen from his pen, but that, in writing the life, he had imbibed a portion of the humble, modest, catholic and, in all respects, truly Christian spirit of the subject of his Memoir. In a man of education, like Mr. H.,* we might naturally look for something higher and better than a disposition to charge upon any individuals, or body of individuals, that the doctrines which they hold, after inquiry and on evidence, are promptly received by them, because those doctrines flatter pride and are indulgent to corruption. We lament that he has so learned Christ: and from these harsh, disgusting anathemas, pronounced by a fallible mortal, we appeal first to that celestial Tribunal which cannot err, and next to those of our fellow-men and fellow-Christians, whose judgments are not blinded by prejudice, and whose kind and equitable feelings are not impeded by any overweening attachment to sects and parties. It is the least evil of such denunciations, from a person of Mr. H.'s character and station, that they contract and embitter the intercourse of social life:† they have a

* The biographer's attachment to ministers and members of his own religious denomination, is so natural, that we are not astounded at his availing himself of this opportunity of sketching the character of the late Rev. Andrew Fuller. This he has done with skill and elegance (pp. 52, &c.): he has shewn, that it was a character very *unlike* to Mr. Toller's, whose education at Daventry, while it cherished his kindly feelings, was auspicious to the growth of an unfeignedly humble temper.

† "The Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." Even in a country and age boasting to be enlightened, how often and how painfully is the fact exemplified! When such men as Mr. H. fulminate their bitter exclamations, and, whether from the pulpit or the press, level, as ex cathedra, their invectives against those "who follow not with *them*," the natural consequence in respect of the mass of the people is, that the *odium theologicum* gains fresh vigour. This temper and this conduct on the part of avowed Christians towards each other, has multiplied unbelievers. Yet bigotry of this sort is not peculiar to avowed Christians. See a

far worse tendency, and exert a still more pernicious influence; inasmuch as they divert the regards of the bulk of professed Christians from the only legitimate standard of the truth or falsehood of religious doctrines, from the Sacred Volume exhibited in a genuine text, and interpreted agreeably to the soundest criticism. Whenever Mr. H. shall appear in the field of honourable warfare, and "contend lawfully;" whenever he shall not be reluctant to stand exclusively and fairly on *the ground of scripture*, he may perhaps be rendered sensible of the difference between reasoning, on the one hand, and declamation and invective, on the other. To *argue*, will scarcely injure any man's reputation, even should he argue unsuccessfully: to deal only in unweighed charges and assertions, cannot be permitted even to the biographer of Mr. Toller; and, indeed, in the biographer of such a man it is peculiarly unbecoming.

As a relief from this train of thought, and from the very offensive passage which called it forth, we gladly turn to a topic of another kind:

"Of the conduct of his academical studies" [Mr. Toller's] "nothing memorable is recorded. From a very accomplished man, who, I believe, was his fellow-student, I have merely heard that he had no relish for the mathematics, a circumstance which has been often recorded in the biography of men of indisputable intellectual preeminence."—P. 6.

There may be justness in our author's remark, popularly taken: yet its real accuracy or inaccuracy depends on the meaning affixed to the words "intellectual preeminence." If this language denote a *mind of great general powers*, we doubt, whether many such a mind has felt no relish for the mathematics, in the course of its elementary education: but if, by "intellectual pre-eminence" we are to understand pre-eminence in taste and sensibility and delicate perception, then the observation is less inadmissible. We shall refer to the opinion of a most competent and impartial judge: * and we beg to caution our

remarkable anecdote in Niebuhr's Trav. (Amsterd. 1776,) I. 240.

* Memoirs of G. Wakefield, I. 82, 83.

readers against the practical error of supposing, that a youth's disrelish to the elements of mathematics, is a characteristic, universal, or even common, indication of genius, or of "indisputable intellectual preeminence." "I can scarcely account," says Mr. Wakefield, "for an indisposition to such theories, but from a defect of judgment or dexterity, in the teacher."

To the biographer's criticisms on the style, &c., of Mr. Toller's sermons,* we shall attend in a future and a separate article. Nothing remains for us, at present, but just to notice his *excursus* on church discipline, under which head he further digresses (pp. 21, &c.) to renew certain insinuations and charges, that have been already the subject of our animadversion. What is the scriptural constitution of a Christian Church? The question is important, but accompanied with difficulties. In resolving it, let the genius of the gospel be consulted. With Mr. Hall, we deprecate secularity: we would utterly exclude, if possible, the spirit of the world, and therefore spiritual pride and the love of having preeminence. A pious man may be ignorant and illiterate: and it is not every thing which should be entrusted to individuals of this description. Our author's immediate predecessor at Cambridge, was accustomed to speak of "a Lord-brother" as one of "the worst monsters" in a church professing to be a church of Christ: with at least the *genus* Mr. H. cannot be unacquainted.

N.

ART. II.—*East-India Unitarian Tracts.*

THE Unitarian controversy is agitated with eagerness and zeal at Calcutta. Besides the publications of Rammohun Roy and the Missionaries, several pamphlets have appeared on both sides of the question, of which, by the favour of a friend, we have obtained, and now proceed to give an account of, no less than nine.

Nos. I. and II. are "Queries" (Pts.

1 and 2,) "for the Serious Consideration of Trinitarians," dated Calcutta, May 9 and 12, 1823. These Queries are taken from *The Christian Reformer*, Vol. I. pp. 87, &c., and Vol. III. 24, &c. They have been frequently reprinted in England, and we are glad to see them in an East-Indian type, persuaded that they are well adapted to awaken inquiry in the minds of candid readers.

No. III. contains "Two Dialogues," dated Calcutta, May 16, 1823. The first, "between a Trinitarian Missionary and three Chinese Converts," is a theological *jeu d'esprit* taken from *The Christian Reformer*, Vol. IV. pp. 10, &c., of which the point is likely to be felt by an Oriental reader. The second, "between an Unitarian Minister and an Itinerant Bookseller," from the same work, Vol. II. pp. 19, &c., being one of a number of "Recollections, or Religious Anecdotes," furnished by Mr. Wright.

No. IV. is "A Selection of Passages from the Old and New Testaments in proof of the Unity of God," signed WM. ADAM, and dated Calcutta, May 20, 1823. This paper concludes with the following appeal:

"The Unitarians say, that if there be any meaning in language, the above quotations prove God to be numerically one; and they call upon Trinitarians to prove, by passages equally plain and decisive, that in the Unity of the Godhead there is a Trinity of persons."

No. V. is "A Faithful and Well-authenticated Report of the Theological Discussion which took place in Calcutta, on Tuesday, May 20, 1823, at a Meeting assembled by Dr. R. Tytler, who had intimated in the newspapers that he would that evening deliver the 6th of a Course of Lectures on Theology, and publicly challenged those who might dissent from the Doctrines advanced to state their objections." Dr. Tytler is of the medical profession, but has been led by religious zeal to devote himself to theological studies. His system is ultra-Trinitarianism, of the Hutchinsonian school. He makes a great parade of erudition, but his learning is less certain than his being "a complete master of the vulgar tongue." (Report, p. 1.) He was confronted at the "public discussion" with none but

* To Mr. T.'s single sermons, already mentioned in p. 178, should be added, one that he printed on the death of the Princess Charlotte.

laymen, but these seem to have been fully able to grapple with his violence and bigotry. Rammohun Roy, from the beginning, and Mr. Adam, after a time, declined meeting so wild and furious an antagonist. After the debate, the Doctor proclaimed a victory. This occasioned the present "Report." In the true spirit of bigotry, the Doctor also announced that the judgment of Heaven had fallen upon one of his opponents, who died suddenly soon after the meeting: this subject was taken up in the native newspaper, the *Bengal Hurkaru*, and the cruel defamation received its merited chastisement. (The Report, &c., is inserted in the number for this month of *The Christian Reformer*, to which the reader is referred.)

No. VI. is Dr. Tytler's "Substance of a Discourse in Vindication of the Divinity of our Lord," dated Calcutta, May 25, 1823. This is a curious piece of Cabbalistic lore, interlarded with denunciations against heretics, blasphemers and the like fearful characters. It is unanswerable because unintelligible or ridiculous. We give a short specimen:

"Jesus is, therefore, the Alpha and Omega, and he is so because there are two languages sanctified to the great purposes of religion, the Hebrew or language used in the Church founded upon Moses and the Prophets, and the Greek employed in the Church founded upon the Apostles, of which Jesus Christ is the chief Foundation Stone. Hence he is A Alpha or α , the incipient letter of Elohim in Hebrew or Aleim, and Ω Omega, because he revealed himself to St. John in Greek, and this is the incipient letter of $\Omega\mathbf{N}$,—"I am HO $\Omega\mathbf{N}$ " which is the translation in the Septuagint Version of AHEE ASHUR AHEE, 'I am that I am,' in English."—Pp. 17, 18.

No. VII. is a "Dissection of Dr. Tytler's 'Substance.' By Jeremy Carver, M. D.," dated Calcutta, June 6, 1823. This is an ironical piece, quite *ad hominem*.

No. VIII. is an answer to the above by the redoubted M. D., entitled, "The Glorious Triumph of Truth; or, The Unitarian's Recantation extorted by Dr. Tytler," dated June 7, 1823. There is nothing in the pamphlet answering to the flaming title. It begins, "Upon the memorable

evening of the 20th of May, 1823, Socinianism received from my hands its final overthrow in Calcutta," &c.; and concludes—"this subtilty, this boasted Reason will not always avail—there is one SIN, one BLASPHEMY, declared to be unpardonable; and Satan, aware of the wretched state to which he has reduced both himself and his deluded tools, trembling through the mouths of his advocates, affects to deny the divinity of his Lord and Maker, or is now seen supplicating for mercy,—by obstinately maintaining that the Holy Jesus was a mere man; as it is impossible, say they, JEHOVAH would, for the salvation of mankind, have subjected himself to CRUCIFIXION; and hence the Unitarianism of the present age is more a sign of the Devil's terror than Satanical presumption. It is the last corner into which the malignant influence is driven, that commenced with Cain, was exhibited by Judas and Caiaphas, has wandered from Arius to Mahomet, from the latter to Socinus, from him to Priestly, (Priestley,) and lastly is seen in those who are at present deluging Calcutta with infidel tracts," &c.

No. IX. The last pamphlet of the series (we take them in the order in which they are numbered by some pen in India) is "A Vindication of the Incarnation of the Deity, as the Common Basis of Hindooism and Christianity, &c. &c. By Ram Doss." Calcutta, June 3, 1823. This is really a curious pamphlet. It is a *bonâ fide* attempt by a Hindoo to shew that Hindooism and Trinitarian Christianity are kindred religions! The zealous Brahmin is doing on his side what Maurice and some other Christians have done on theirs. They go far to prove their point, but writing for Christian readers, we may say that every argument that assimilates Trinitarianism to Pagan idolatry shews that it is in opposition to genuine Christianity. Ram Doss is so remarkable a theologian, and his pamphlet presses so directly upon the vital part of the Unitarian controversy, that we must allot to him singly a place in the Review in our next Number.

ART. III.—*Unitarians Not Guilty of Denying the Lord that Bought Them. A Sermon preached before the Association of Unitarian Christians residing at Hull, Thorne, Lincoln, and adjacent Places, at the Chapel, Bowl-Alley Lane, Hull, on Thursday, Sept. 18, 1823.* By C. Wellbeloved. York: Printed. Sold by Longman and Co., and by R. Hunter, in London. 8vo. pp. 38. 1824.

THIS highly valuable composition belongs to a class of discourses from the pulpit, of which, in the present age, we have few examples. In substance, it is a careful, accurate, judicious and well-arranged exposition of a much-abused passage of the New Testament, and of some important scriptural phraseology: and the preacher, with great felicity, applies the exposition to the purpose of vindicating Christian truth and of enforcing Christian virtue. From 2 Pet. ii. 1, ["But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction,"] Mr. W. addresses his hearers and readers with powerful argument and mild persuasion. In the first paragraph he gives a summary of the characteristic tenets of the persons generally called Unitarians: in behalf of these individuals, he claims that their profession be credited and their sincerity admitted. With justice and feeling he complains of the heavy, the ill-founded, and often the mutually inconsistent censures, which are heaped upon them; of the gross misapplication of certain scriptural threatenings and anathemas to their case. Not that for *all* the members of the body so denominated he challenges exemption from self-allowed faults and vices; while, as the effect of his knowledge of Unitarian Christians, he deems himself fully authorized, and, in justice to them, bound to assert, that many among them, if by their works they can be known, are men fearing God, and departing from evil. In numerous instances, the most palpable ignorance and prejudice dictate the bitter and inequitable reproaches with which these persons are assailed:

and the opposition of others, it may well be apprehended, is called forth by motives of a less pure and worthy nature. Certainly, no fact can be more notorious than that Unitarianism is "a sect every where spoken against." Now Mr. W., though he would by no means endeavour to maintain on this ground, that it is the doctrine for which the apostles of our Lord, and even our Lord himself, suffered, yet, conscientiously believing it to be so, after a diligent, serious and impartial investigation of the Scriptures, comforts his brethren and himself by the reflection, that their fate is no other than Jesus predicted to his first and true disciples; no other than we know did actually befall them. Thus the hard thoughts, the reproachful language and the injurious treatment, which men entertain and employ, furnish no evidence that the cause against which they are directed, is not the cause of truth, of righteousness and of God.

No charge perhaps is more frequently alleged against Unitarian Christians, than that they *deny the Lord who bought them*, and no conclusion more confidently drawn, than that they shall for this, *bring upon themselves*, if not *swift*, at least *final destruction*. But even did they who so cite these words judge rightly of their meaning, and could they prove that what Peter here says was designed by him to mark those who denied the Lord Jesus, still, we must ask, how can this language be applied to any, who, whatever may be their views of the doctrine of the gospel, yet profess to receive that gospel, and who take upon themselves the name of Christ? Of all the sects into which the Christian world is divided, not one can be produced, the members of which, more strenuously maintain the Divine Mission of Jesus, or more ardently and successfully oppose the unbeliever. This praise even our most determined adversaries allow, that to Unitarian writers the public is indebted for some of the ablest works in defence of the divine origin and authority of Christianity. It is surely incredible that the apostle should speak of these, when he predicts, that false teachers shall arise, denying the Lord who bought them.

But it will be said, that *we deny*

his Deity, nor acknowledge him as the second person of the Godhead. True, we do deny the Jesus of the Athanasian and the Nicene Creeds; of the Liturgy and the Articles of the Established Church; of the Confessions of Faith adopted by almost all the churches of Christendom; but let no one, on this account, apply to us the language of the Apostle Peter in the text, till he has proved that the doctrine of these creeds on this point, is indeed the doctrine of the New Testament. The Jesus of such creeds and confessions we must deny, and confess him alone to whom the apostles have with one voice borne witness.* Whatever Jesus has declared himself to be, whatever his apostles have taught concerning him, that we desire to know and to believe. Every title which Jesus has claimed, we willingly ascribe to him; every honour which he has demanded, we would reverently pay; nor do we yield to any in admiration of his character, gratitude for his services, or those scriptural expressions of love and veneration which he claims.

Should it be further said, that we, nevertheless, deny him in the important character he sustains, as the Lord who bought us, we ask, whether they who confidently apply this language to us, understand its genuine import? We cannot but think that, in general, they do not. It by no means follows that we deny the Lord who bought us, because we do not acknowledge him as doing that for us, which is ascribed to him only in the fallible comments of theologians, in the creeds of ecclesiastical synods and councils. We may deny Jesus the Saviour, as he is represented to us by an Augustin, a Luther, a Calvin, or an Arminius, and yet be pure and consistent believers in him of whom Moses and the prophets spake, and whom his own inspired disciples have called "the Apostle and High-Priest of our profession." As in respect of the person, so in respect of the office of Christ, we are willing and desirous to be guided by the sacred writers. Their language we adopt, on that we form our creed, and in the terms they use, we wish to express it.

To whomsoever the words in the text refer, to them all that follows is intended to be applied. But surely the most determined adversary of Unitarian principles, and the severest accuser of his brethren, will not be so blind, or so thoroughly destitute of candour, as to say that the whole description is applicable to the doctrines of Unitarians, or to those who maintain them. The text is the only portion which any one will presume to consider in this light. But however common the practice of thus taking passages out of their proper connexion may be, we must protest against it in this and in all cases, as contrary to every rule of just interpretation.

Thus far Mr. W. has argued upon the supposition that the words of the apostle are properly understood to refer to the Lord Jesus, and to the effects of his mission; and even on this supposition he has shewn that it is an act of injustice to apply them to Unitarians. But he maintains, that it is not the Lord Jesus of whom Peter here speaks. They who are not obliged to trust to any version of the apostle's words, are without excuse if they so misinterpret, and so wrongfully apply them. For they must know that the original term used by the sacred writer,* and rendered by our translators *Lord*, is not that which in other instances is selected to denote the Lord Jesus, but in such a connexion as that in which we here find it, is appropriated to the God and Father of the Lord Jesus, the Sovereign Ruler of Nature. The four other passages in which it occurs,† are decisive of its import. Archbishop Newcome, accordingly, renders it in the place before us, "The Sovereign Lord."

If any persons think that the phrase *who bought them*, cannot properly be used concerning the Father, and therefore that it here designates Jesus the Son of God, an investigation of scriptural phraseology may correct his error. The terms which had been employed by the writers of the Old Testament to describe the state and

* Διπορευς.

† Luke ii. 29; Acts iv. 24; [2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude 4; Rev. vi. 10.

* Acts ii. 22, iv. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 5.

privileges of God's ancient people, the Jews, were readily adopted by the writers of the New Testament, to describe the state and privileges of those, who, by faith in Christ, had now become the people and family of God. This remark applies especially to the apostolical epistles, many of the apparent difficulties in which may hence be easily solved, and the doctrines that have been too commonly deduced from them, shewn to be without any foundation or support.

Almighty God was pleased to conduct the descendants of Abraham into Egypt, and thence, at length, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, to deliver them from the oppression under which they were held there; and, in reference to this deliverance, he is said to have *saved* them, to have *bought*, *purchased* and *redeemed* them.* While, by interposing in their favour, he is represented to have *bought* the Israelites, so, by afterwards permitting them, as the punishment of their apostacy, to be led into captivity by neighbouring nations, he is said to *sell* them.† Indeed, the terms *buying* and *selling* are so frequently used in scripture in a metaphorical sense, that it seems impossible for a reader of ordinary attention and judgment to mistake their signification, wherever they occur.‡ It is in strict conformity with the phraseology so prevalent in the Old Testament, that in the writings of the New Testament, sometimes God himself, and sometimes he whom God sent, is said to *purchase*, to *buy*, to *redeem*, those who hear and embrace the doctrine of the gospel, and are thus delivered from the slavery of idolatrous and evil principles and practices, to which they were before sold or addicted.§ Now as no one ever imagines that God paid any price, or offered any equivalent to Pharaoh, King of Egypt, or to any other of their succeeding oppressors, when he *bought* the Israelites, or *redeemed* them from slavery and captivity, so when such phraseology is employed

in the New Testament, in reference to those who had been freed from the bondage of the Mosaic law, of heathen superstition, of ignorance or of vice, it ought never to be considered as teaching or intimating, that Jesus gave, or the Father received, any equivalent, without which the salvation of mankind could not have been effected. When the Apostle Peter speaks of persons who "denied the Sovereign Lord who bought them," he, most probably, refers to some who having received the grace of God by Jesus Christ, either abused or rejected it. A comparison of the text with the parallel passage in Jude, evinces the justness of this interpretation: and we think, with Mr. W., that the men here censured were the Jewish zealots, who are spoken of in every apostolical epistle, as generally displaying an evil character, and as being disturbers of the peace of the church.

The ample and satisfactory exposition, of which we have placed an abridgment before our readers, will prove that sound scriptural criticism is requisite to those who aim at understanding, inculcating and vindicating Divine Truth. With the phraseology of the Old Testament the style of the New Testament must be diligently compared; still more than with that of the classic writers of Greece and Rome. In the simple form of society, under which the Jewish people lived, and in a language so scanty as the Hebrew, and so characterised by words borrowed from objects of sense, it was extremely natural that the verb *buy* should be employed to signify the act of *procuring* a wished-for object by means of great labour, exertion and self-denial: nor can we with reason wonder that the *secondary* meaning of this verb is vastly comprehensive.

On consulting one of the passages to which Mr. W. refers, we perceived, not without pain, that King James's translators, Lowth, Dodson and Stock render the original word (*buy*) by the English term *recover*. The text alluded to, is Isaiah xi. 11; in respect of the just interpretation of which clause it would seem impossible to entertain a doubt. It is much to be desired that a translation of the Bible be as *literal* as is consistent with re-

* Exod. xv. 16; Deut. xxxii. 6; Psa. lxxiv. 2; Isa. xi. 11.

† Judges ii. 14; Deut. xxxii. 30.

‡ Prov. xxiii. 23; xix. 8, &c. &c.

§ 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20; vii. 23; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

gard to the difference of *idioms*. The advantage of reducing this maxim to practice, would be, that the *English* reader, distinctly seeing the import of the Hebrew or the Greek phrase, in such an instance as what we now cite, would be prepared for discerning it in other cases, where exactly the same phrase occurs. Thus he would be the better enabled to interpret scripture in the exercise of his own sober judgment, and to expound it by itself.*

* Similar examples are furnished in those passages of the book of Proverbs, where the Hebrew verb (*buy*) is rendered *get* or *getteth*.

The conclusion of Mr. W.'s discourse, is very practical and solemn. He reminds his audience, that they may be guilty of denying the Sovereign Lord who bought them, and may thus bring upon themselves final condemnation, though not in the manner usually imagined. Such is the character, and such will be the fate, of those, who, as the effect of their want of religious principle, abandon, compromise or dishonour the pure truths of the gospel.

N.

OBITUARY.

March 13, in *Dublin*, at the age of 27 years, JOSEPH WILLIAM HONE, surgeon. He was attacked by a fever, got in the discharge of his professional duties, and carried off after a few days' illness. He was mild and affable in his manners, and much beloved by all his friends. Enemies he had none. He was an Unitarian, but wished that all persons should enjoy freedom of religious opinion, unshackled by human laws. He studied hard at his profession, and passed his examination at the College of Surgeons in *Dublin* with *éclat*. He visited the Continent last year, and intended to have spent the summer of this year in Italy, and afterwards to have taken a medical degree in an English College, and to have practised in London. He was the eldest of eight sons of Joseph Hone, of *Dublin*, who has been a member of the Unitarian society for many years.

Dublin, 24th March, 1824.

April 18, after a short illness, EDWARD JONES, Bard to the Prince of Wales, breathed his last, aged 72. He was a native of Merionethshire, in North Wales. He published, about 30 years ago, a work entitled, "*Relics of the Bards*," which contains much valuable historical information; also, a collection of Welsh Airs, arranged for the harp, an instrument which Mr. Jones performed on after the manner of his forefathers, that is, he played the treble with his left hand, and the bass with the right. Mr. Jones possessed a library of rare books, both MS. and printed, many of which he has lately disposed of. He was a member of the Royal Society of Musicians, the Governors of which, on hearing that he was totally unable to follow his professional pursuits, granted him an annuity of fifty pounds per annum; but he only lived to enjoy the first payment of the Institution's bounty.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

Corporation and Test Acts.

AGREEABLY to the *Resolutions* inserted in our last number, p. 184, the Deputies for the Protection of the Civil Rights of Protestant Dissenters have issued forms of Petition to both Houses of Parliament, to be signed by the congregations in and near London. It is intended, we believe, that these petitions should be presented forthwith, but that no motion shall be founded upon them until the next Session. The body of ministers have appointed a Deputation to meet the Com-

mittee of Deputies, on whose report of the Conference will depend the resolutions which the ministers will adopt. The general co-operation of the Dissenters is absolutely necessary to success in this great and important measure, and we recommend not only that petitions be sent up from all parts of the country, but also that Committees be formed in large towns and populous districts to combine the efforts of the Dissenters into one strong movement, and to unite the Dissenters of London and the country in their common object.

PARLIAMENTARY.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

APRIL 2d, 1824.

Unitarians' Marriage Bill.

ON the order of the day for the second reading of the Bill for granting relief to Unitarian Dissenters in the matter of their Marriages :

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE, in rising to make his promised motion, commenced by observing, that he should not have felt it necessary to trespass on their Lordships' attention at any length, if it had not been intimated to him that an opposition was intended. The Bill which he was now about to propose for a second reading had originated in the petitions presented by the body of Unitarians to the Committee, which had sat last session, on the Marriage Laws, and complaining that the marriage ceremony of the Church of England, to which they were obliged to submit, was such as, in their consciences, they could not approve. He could state to their Lordships that it was generally felt by the Members of the Committee, as he hoped it would also by the House itself, that some relief ought to be afforded them. Before he proceeded to consider the relief now proposed, he would state the principle on which it was founded. There were two duties incumbent on the Legislature in providing for the due regulation of marriages. One was entirely of a civil nature ; the other was compounded of civil and religious considerations. It was a civil duty to provide against clandestine marriages, and to provide for due celebration and registration ; and next it was of importance that the contract involving such important consequences both to society and to the individual, should be performed in a manner the most likely to bind the conscience. The Legislature had been called upon to provide against clandestine marriages ; and on the ground he had already stated, of giving the strongest religious sanction to marriage of which the contract was susceptible, they were bound to adopt the proposition which he should now make. The measure had been misunderstood both within doors and without. It had been represented as an alteration of the Liturgy, by law established : this was entirely a mistake. Their Lordships, however, would not wish to violate the consciences of those who differed from them in religious opinion, or to force them into the Established Church, in order to make them signify an approbation of its forms, which they would not acknowledge upon any other occasion. If it was of import-

ance that the contract of marriage should be as binding as possible, with that view it should be solemnized in the manner most conformable to their religious feelings and belief, in short, in the manner most likely to impress itself on the mind. He should, therefore, propose, that the persons called Unitarians should be authorized to celebrate marriages in their own chapels, duly registered for that purpose, having previously given publicity by the publication of banns, and on the payment of dues in the Established Church. He would have preferred certainly to have brought in a more general measure, but he felt, after the experience he had gained on the subject, that great practical difficulty would arise from its extension to other Dissenters. Many persons might raise such objections to forms as the Legislature could not anticipate, and a laxity might possibly arise which would favour the evil of clandestine marriages. Upon these grounds, he thought it best to limit the present Bill to the persons who had most reason, *in foro conscientiae*, to object to the ceremony of the Church of England. It had been stated liberally in that House, and from the Right Reverend Bench on a former occasion, that some provision ought to be made to save the consciences of those who differed so widely from the Church of England, the moment such a case was fairly brought forward. He therefore proposed, in this Bill, that after the publication of banns in the usual form in the parish church, persons of the Unitarian persuasion should be allowed to have marriages solemnized in their own places of worship, (these places having been registered as such for a year at least,) and by a minister of their own denomination. The parties who brought forward the measure were desirous to give every civil security, and, therefore, if it were thought advisable that ministers should be specially licensed or registered also, he did not see any objection. It might also be thought expedient to add, as in the case of the ministers of the Church, that the punishment of transportation should be visited upon any minister presuming to offend against these regulations. Though, in their petitions, the Unitarians considered the publication of banns as the best security that could be given against clandestine marriages, and though the Bill itself was founded upon that principle, he should not object, in case any better security could be devised, to give the public the advantage. Though, amongst all the Dissenters, the class selected for the operation of the present measure was the one which had differed most widely from the

Church of England, he did not see that on that ground the Legislature should refuse them this privilege. If it was an indulgence, it was an indulgence in the shape of a burden, for these individuals only brought upon themselves double trouble and expense. He was not, he would confess, prepared to hear from any Noble Lord, in the present enlightened state of the world, that the Unitarians were a sect standing without the pale of society, that it was expedient that marriages should be prohibited amongst them, or solemnized in the manner least calculated to become binding upon their consciences: and unless they were disposed to argue either that Unitarians were out of the pale of society, or, being within that pale, ought not to marry at all, or, doing so, to pay the penalty of violated conscience, he could not conceive how the present Bill could be resisted.—The Noble Marquis concluded by moving that the Bill should be read a second time.

The ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY.—“I have always expressed myself extremely desirous of paying every respect to the feelings of religious conscience. I believe, my Lords, that the scruples of the Unitarians are so founded on religious faith and conscience; and seeing that, I conceive them to be entitled to the consideration of the House; and the question then only arises how the relief can be best afforded. Some little time ago it was proposed to alter the Liturgy of the Church in this respect; and to this plan I thought it my duty, in common with many others, decidedly to object. If relief is to be sought only by transferring the grievance; by removing the scruple from the few to the many; by altering the religious ordinances of one church to meet the objections of another; to such a plan I should always object. But this plan was abandoned, and last session a Bill was submitted of a very different character; and whatever objections applied to it, it certainly was not chargeable with attempting to transfer the grievances from the smaller to the larger portion of the community. That Bill, my Lords, was supported by several, and by me among the rest: it was opposed by others, and those others formed on that occasion a majority which rejected the Bill. At that time, however, there appeared a disposition on all sides to give the relief desired under *some* form. My Lords, that relief can only be afforded in one of two ways; either by allowing these parties to celebrate marriages in their own places, and according to their own forms, or by submitting the Liturgy of the Church of England to some alterations calculated to remove the objections of

Unitarian Dissenters. My Lords, to this last plan I objected in the last session; to it I still object; and deprecating, as I do, any alteration of our excellent Liturgy, I trust I always shall object to it. I was then told that no alteration was intended; that to be sure some portions of the service were omitted, but that no part of it was submitted to substitution or alteration. But surely it cannot be contended, that as marked and decided an alteration may not be effected by omission as by any substitution. Was it not asked, by this omission, to put aside the recognition of one of the most essential articles of our faith—the doctrine of the Trinity? If we were, at the request of objectors to our doctrines, to put them away from our service, to present our formularies thus mutilated and unhallowed to their purposes, would not this be to make the Church the handmaid to Dissent? Such a proposition, my Lords, was not, could not, and, I trust, never *will* be listened to. The only plan then, that remains for adoption is that which I have before noticed; and I now come to consider the provisions of this Bill. It is very true, my Lords, that in this Bill it is proposed to provide for relief of conscience and also for the preservation of civil convenience. The first, undoubtedly, it accomplishes; the second, I do not think that it does in its present form, and considerable alterations will therefore be necessary in the Committee. The Noble Mover has stated that it was his wish to have introduced a measure comprehending all classes of Dissenters, and supposes that it may be thought extraordinary that this favour should be granted only to this particular sect. My Lords, *favour* is not the ground on which we are to proceed. Scruple of conscience is the ground on which we are to entertain this Bill as a matter of *justice*. If such scruple exists, (and in the case of the Unitarians I feel that it *does* exist,) they are *entitled* to relief at our hands. I am aware, my Lords, that this cannot be done, after all our care, without *some* hazard of civil insecurity; but scruples of conscience outweigh that hazard; and ought to do so. The banns will be published in a place to which Unitarians do not resort; and the marriage may take place ten miles off; and there may be hazard in this, no doubt. As to the supposed claim of the general body of Dissenters, it is founded on a different principle. It is not founded as here in conscientious scruple of doctrines, important and essential, but on objections, for the most part fond and fanciful, to our forms and discipline, scanty and inoffensive as they are.” On these grounds, the Arch-

bishop concluded by saying, he was friendly to the general principle of the Bill, and would readily vote for its going into a Committee, where the points in which it was deficient could receive every attention.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that his strong regard for the interests of the Church must be his apology for presuming to differ very materially from the Rt. Rev. Prelate. He should, for the present, lay out of view the particular provisions of the Bill, and make a few observations on its general principle. And, first, it appeared to him extremely material to have all doubt removed as to the legal character in which this sect appeared to ask their relief. The preamble stated, that certain persons scrupled the doctrine of the Trinity. He apprehended they meant to say that they were deniers of that doctrine. He hoped their Lordships would do him the justice to believe that, when he was speaking of the law on this subject, he was referring only to the question how that law actually stood, and not entering into what it might be expedient or proper it should be. When he spoke of doctrines, too, he spoke only of doctrines as supported by the Church, not entering into the speculative discussions which individuals might entertain, as to the grounds on which they might be supposed to rest. That Church, and the doctrines it professed, it was his duty to support; to that Church he belonged, and he trusted he should be always found to maintain it to the best of his ability. Then on this Bill the first question was, whether it was not necessary that the first step they took should be some declaration, whether the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity be or be not legal at common law. On this subject he could not help saying great misapprehension had prevailed as to the supposed effect of the late Act. The Toleration Act expressly excluded from its benefit deniers of the doctrine of the Trinity. And then came the 9 and 10 of William and Mary, the repeal of which had been extremely misunderstood, when it was supposed that the repeal of the Act made that legal which was not so before. He meant, that that Act had not altered the common law, whatever it was. He was not saying what that common law was; he was only contending that the doubt which existed ought to be removed. The Act of William and Mary did not create the offence, it only prescribed a new punishment. In his view it declared what was then conceived to be an offence before; but it gave a punishment which no man living could wish should continue, and which they therefore repealed; but no one, he was sure,

had the least idea of affecting the common law by such repeal. He was not entering on the question what that common law was, or whether it ought to be so or not; he only said, that before the Bill proceeded, it ought to be determined how it stood. The great objection he made to the Bill was, that it recognized a system as different from the system of Christianity of the Church as light from darkness. Nothing could be more opposed to each other than the Church and these Unitarians. He did not there enter into the question which was right in doctrine and which was wrong; but they ought to understand on what footing they were to stand, and to what extent they were to go. They had already excepted Jews and Quakers, and if they were to listen to these religious scruples, where was this to stop? Could they say to any one, to the Catholics for instance, that theirs were not religious scruples? If these parties, who of all the Dissenters were diametrically opposed to the most essential doctrines of the Church, were, because they came there to avow their denial of such doctrines, (and, by the bye, they never thought of these scruples till the Acts against them had been repealed,) to have relief, why not separate them entirely, as they had done the Jews and Quakers? Why was the Church to be the handmaid to the scruples of these parties? Was a man to come to the Bishop and say, I deny your doctrines, therefore give me your licence to do so; and to go to the minister and say, I deny your doctrines, give me your certificate of my banns, and for the same denial register my marriage? Was he to go to those persons who reverence these doctrines and avow the denial, for which it is not clear he may not be punishable at common law; and are they to be bound and compelled, under pains and penalties, to be aiding and abetting to this his dissent? Was not this to make the Church the handmaid to her own disgrace;—to make her the servant, for civil purposes, of those who deny her first and most essential doctrines? By the repeal of the statute of William and Mary, and of the excepting clause in the Toleration Act, they had given the benefit of that Act to these persons. But what had it given? It was doubtful to him whether it did more than repeal the particular punishment to an offence which the Legislature conceived to be punishable before, and so exempt these parties from particular penalties. Did that go to alter the common law? God forbid he should take on himself to decide what the common law was; all he contended for was, that whatever it was before 9 and 10 William

and Mary, it so remained after the repeal. As long as he sat there he should oppose making the Church subservient to the support of the greatest heresy to her doctrines. The most essential of those doctrines he had always understood to be the Trinity; and how could it be contended that she should be made to assist the plans of those who openly denied and impugned it? He should, therefore, vote against the Bill altogether.

LORD LIVERPOOL did not rise to enter into a discussion of the particular provisions of the Bill. He should vote for the second reading, and for going into a Committee, where several alterations would doubtless be necessary, for he had no difficulty in saying, that if the Bill were to come out of the Committee in its present shape, he should oppose it hereafter. He was, for instance, prepared to give relief to the case where both parties were Unitarians, but not where only one was so. The Church, he thought, had a right to require the marriage of all its members. In the case of Jews and Quakers, both must be of that persuasion. He thought too, that the fact of the parties being Unitarians, must not stand alone on their declaration, but that some certificate should be required from their minister of the fact. What he meant was, to be sure that the parties were *bonâ fide* entitled to the provision in their favour. He thought the Bill might be so amended as to reach all his objections, and should vote for the second reading.

The Bishop of CHESTER, before he entered on the reasons for which he opposed the Bill, begged leave to observe, that no man could be more favourable to every sound principle of civil and religious toleration than himself. Human laws ought never to be used for the purpose of imposing any unjust restriction on conscientious feelings. In these principles of toleration he had been educated, and the same, he trusted, he should always support,

“Dum spiritus hos regit artus.”

The intercourse between the creature and the Creator ought to be free as air, for this plain reason, that we were bound to obey God rather than man. But the present question was not one of religious toleration, but of civil jurisdiction; it was a question, not of Church doctrine, but of Church discipline. It would be only to waste their Lordships' time, were he to endeavour to shew the advantages of a national and established religion. Those advantages had been proved by many excellent writers: and among others by the excellent author of “Moral

and Political Philosophy,” an author who required no praise of his, and to whom, he was sure, the Noble Lord opposite would be ready to pay the just tribute of his admiration. But if it was clear that the establishment of a national religion was advantageous, it was equally clear that that establishment should be upheld and protected by peculiar rights and privileges. That marriages should be celebrated in the Churches of the Establishment was one of the privileges which had been conceded to it; and having been so conceded, as a peculiar right and privilege, it ought not to be taken away without the assignment of a valid and sufficient reason. In his opinion, the Unitarians had not made out that sufficient reason. This was a point, he admitted, which he was bound to prove, and should proceed to do so. The fair way of considering the subject was to consider what it was, according to the marriage ceremony of the Church of England, that the Unitarian was called upon to subscribe or to declare. In the first place, the Unitarian was called upon to subscribe his name as one of the parties to the contract there made. He could find no difficulty in doing that. But besides this, he was bound, in the progress of the ceremony, to say, “With this ring I thee wed, with my body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” But were not these the words of Scripture? If the Unitarian believed in Scripture, and that these very words were there, (as no doubt he did,) what reasonable objection could he have to repeat those words? He might affix to them what meaning he thought most scriptural. Every one was at perfect liberty to do that. It was the spirit of the services, as of the Articles of our excellent Church, to use general scriptural language, to which all might be left to affix their own interpretations. But how could those words be considered as objectionable by the Unitarians, when the following words were used by the Unitarians themselves in the baptismal part of their Form of Prayer, of which he (the Bishop of Chester) had obtained the last edition:—“I baptize thee into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” To be sure the word “in” was changed into “into,” but he did not see what difference that could make. It seemed to him, therefore, to be impossible that they could object to words in the marriage ceremony of the Church of England, which they themselves pronounced in their own forms. So far, therefore, their Lordships would agree, that the Unitarians

rians had at present no just cause for complaint. He wished, however, to meet this important subject fairly and without reserve; and he would, therefore, admit that the marriage service of the Church added a blessing by the minister, in the following words: "God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, bless," &c. But here he would ask, if the Unitarian did not conceive himself to receive any good from a benediction in the name or mode of Deity, which he did not admit, still could he think it did him any harm? He could have no objection to its being given in the terms which, in the apprehension of the minister of the Church, adequately described the Being whom he adored. The Unitarian was not bound to assent to the accuracy of those terms. He might affix to them what meaning he pleased. There was no force or compulsion upon him to induce him to acquiesce in them. The very minister who used them, probably knew that he did not acquiesce in them, and how, therefore, was he aggrieved? He (the Bishop of Chester) would deal with a Unitarian as he should himself wish to be dealt with under similar circumstances. Were he in a foreign country—in a country of Jews, of Catholics or Mussulmen—and it were necessary for him to marry there, no consideration on earth should induce him to subscribe to any form of words, or to declare his assent to any doctrines contrary to his own conviction. But in things indifferent in themselves, even though he might consider them as absurd or false, he should consider any objection as ridiculous, and should hold himself bound to comply with the established laws and ceremonies of the country. Now really, the objection of the Unitarians to conform to the marriage ceremony of the Established Church, appeared to him to be of the latter description. It did not appear to him, that, by acquiescing in the terms of that ceremony, they could be considered *in foro conscientie*, as sinning against any law, either of God or of man. As to the machinery of the Bill, the present was not the fit opportunity to discuss it; but he would just observe, that in the Bill which regulated the marriages of Jews and Quakers, it was provided that both parties must be either Jews or Quakers. If the present Bill passed into a law, let not the House lay the flattering unction to their souls that the same privileges and immunities would not be required by the other sects of Dissenters. Although he was far from wishing to say any thing against the Unitarians, he really did not think that they ought to be considered as a favourite sect. If, therefore, the other sects of

Dissenters were to be invested with the same privileges, let their Lordships consider what a falling off there would be in the number of marriages celebrated by ministers of the Established Church, and what a diminution of their emoluments. He certainly did not mean to lay any great stress on this last argument. If the Dissenters were entitled to this indulgence, let it be granted to them. "*Fiat justitia ruat cælum.*" But unquestionably the effect of such a measure would be, and especially in large manufacturing towns, such as those within his own diocese, to make little livings still less. Now really it seemed hardly fair to deprive the possessors of those little livings of a portion of that stipend which was already sufficiently scanty. Marriage fees formed a large part of the stipend of those clergy who always resided on their livings, faithfully discharging all their sacred functions, and from whom, therefore, it would be very hard to deduct so important a portion of their income. He was aware that the Bill continued "the usual and accustomed fee" to the minister of the Church, but it was well known that the fee fixed by the law was not the one usually given. Such was the view which he took of the question. Whatever effect the arguments which he had urged might have on their Lordships' minds, he could assure them that they had produced conviction in his own. He should be extremely sorry if the opinions which he had expressed should give offence to any person. It was far from his wish to give any such offence. But he was not so unobservant of the signs of the times as not to remark that those who were most clamorous for religious toleration for themselves, were the least inclined to grant even a little toleration to others. If, also, he had the misfortune to differ from any of those with whom it would be his pride and pleasure to agree, that would be to him a source of still deeper regret; but every such circumstance was comparatively unimportant, when put in competition with duty. "*Amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas.*" He trusted, that on all questions in which the interests and the stability of the Church of England were concerned, their Lordships would never shew any thing like apathy or indifference; that they would think that in all these things, "*tua res agitur.*" He trusted that their Lordships would, on the present occasion, exclaim, if not in the exact words, at least in the spirit and feeling of the ancient Barons—"*Nolumus leges ECCLESIE mutari.*"

Lord HARROWBY perfectly agreed with the last speaker as to the duty of that House, if the Bill did, as he supposed,

affect the real interests of the Church. If it did, none would be a more decided opponent than himself. But he could not see any thing in it which in any degree did that. Neither could he admit the force of that prelate's objections to the validity of the Unitarian's scruples. As to the repetition of "the Father, the Son and Holy Ghost," he confessed that it did appear to him to be a strange cavil to object to words which they themselves used. But then came the benediction, and there, he fairly confessed, he could conceive most serious objections in the mind of a person feeling a conscientious difficulty in giving an implied assent to a doctrine which he disbelieved, on one of the most solemn occasions. But really the question was not whether they understood the scruple, and admitted its validity, but whether it was a scruple, *bonâ fide* entertained:—that was the true question. He would not go so far as to say, that any person was entitled to relief on account of scruples which might be obviously frivolous and unimportant, but no one could say this was such a case. Would their Lordships allow themselves to be blessed in the name of Mahomet? And yet, perhaps, the case might not be very different in the mind of an Unitarian to having a benediction in the name of Mahomet.

LORD CHANCELLOR. "Would you permit a Mahometan to set up his religious scruples?"

LORD HARROWBY. "Why not?—Why not a Mahometan as well as a Jew?—I ask, why not a Mahometan? Marriage is, as we consider it, a civil ceremony; to which, to give it a more binding and solemn character to the parties, we affix a religious ceremony. The very object of this is to make it binding on conscience. And how would you effect this, by beginning at the very outset with violating and offending the very conscience on which you depend?" Feeling the justice of the claim as strongly as he did, he would wish to give relief without endangering any of the civil sanctions of society, much less would he injure the Church. This led him to the Lord Chancellor's objection. If he could see that the Church was to be made auxiliary to the encouragement of Dissent, he would as decidedly as any one object; and on this ground he did feel some difficulty as to the provision for granting licences. But how otherwise was the Church brought forward, except as its officers act in a civil capacity? Banns were published in Church, because from the number of persons present publicity is given. The register might be as well done by a layman as a clergyman. It did

happen, however, it was, and very properly, confided to the Church; but this was not in an ecclesiastical capacity. Perhaps the banns might be altogether left to be proclaimed in the places of worship of the Unitarians, and then the objection would be totally removed. He regretted to see such jealousy on such subjects. He was attached to the Church; he was zealous for its dignity and security; but he could not see how these were advanced by raising objections light as air into importance. He objected to much of the Bill as at present framed, but would go into a Committee where it could be improved.

LORD CALTHORPE could not help feeling that the degree of relief which this Bill afforded ought to be granted to the Unitarians, as offering them an opportunity of being married without any violation of their principles; for he thought the strength of the Church did not, and could not arise from persecution. She loved to relieve the honest scruples of men, if, at the same time, she could satisfy herself that the measure of relief was consistent with great and important interests. Considering the remarkable observance of the decencies and proprieties of life by the sect of Unitarian Dissenters, and considering their regular and exemplary discharge of the duties of their situations, which afforded the Church a sufficient guarantee for the due and proper performance of this solemn rite by their ministers, the Church ought not to press her forms upon them too strictly. At the same time, he thought she owed it to herself to seek a separation from persons so totally opposed to her; and he could not help thinking that she ought to do something which would effectually prevent them from being identified with her.—Feeling, as he did, that the doctrine of the Trinity was affirmed by the English Church; that it formed the base of her structure; and that it was infused into all her articles; he could not help thinking that she was bound to shew to those individuals who differed from her in that essential point, however respectable they might be, that she could encourage no ecclesiastical communion with them. He wished to do justice to the merits of the Unitarians, and he should do them great injustice if he did not recognize the excellence of those virtues which had often placed them in the foremost ranks of the friends of humanity and truth; but while he said this, he could not refrain from broadly and decidedly expressing his dissent from the lamentable opinions they held. He called those opinions lamentable, for they appeared to him to strip the Christian reli-

gion of all that made her the grace, hope and consolation of her followers. While, therefore, he respected the merits of the Unitarians, he could not help remembering that they held opinions at variance with what the English Church considered as constituting the very essence of Christianity. The Church of England had marked those doctrines in a distinct and authoritative manner; and she considered those truths not merely in the light of speculative opinions, but as active and fruitful springs of action. But though he spoke of the Unitarian doctrine with pain, he did not wish to speak of its professors with harshness; for that was not consistent with the true Christian mildness on which all the articles and institutions of the Church of England were founded. It did seem to him, that the Church owed to herself, to her supremacy, and to the high and important truths which she taught, to mark in this Bill, her total dissent from the opinions of the Unitarian Dissenters. He had no apprehension, that such a step as the granting of the present Bill would lead to an injurious degree of indulgence, nor to a rash and indiscreet spirit of surrendering all the privileges of the Church. At the same time that he said this, he could not refrain from applauding the conduct of those Prelates, who had deprecated any alteration whatever in the Liturgy. He could not but rejoice, that the Bench of Bishops had refrained from setting a precedent so full of danger. He admired the service of the Church of England; he particularly venerated the Liturgy, which he looked upon with an affection almost equal to that with which he viewed Holy Writ itself; and he thought the Bench of Bishops deserved the thanks of every supporter of the Church of England, for having offered their fair and open opposition to the principles of such a Bill. He was not afraid this relief would afford a means for the further extension of Unitarian doctrines; for, in his opinion, human nature itself happily furnished in its infirmities an antidote to their diffusion: man, amidst the sorrows and cares of this life, required something more consoling, more heart-sustaining, than their cold and precise doctrines. He did not think that such of the Bishops as supported this Bill could be accused of inconsistency, because they had spoken and voted against granting any further concessions to the Catholics. On the contrary, he could easily conceive that they might oppose one, and conscientiously vote in favour of the other. He thought this to be a measure not only of justice to the Unitarian Dissenters, but

to the Church itself. He should give his cordial vote that the Bill be committed, though, with the view he had of the question, he should have thought it better for the Church itself to have asked for the relief which this Bill would give them, than thus to have accorded it as a boon to the Dissenters. He called it a relief to the Church, for the clergy must have felt uneasy in doing that which nearly amounted to profaneness: namely, calling on the Unitarian Dissenter, when appearing at the altar, to do violence to his conscience, in professing sentiments which he positively disavowed, or in using expressions that obliged him to screen himself under mental equivocation and reservation. For these reasons he should give his support to the Bill.

LORD WESTMORELAND opposed the Bill upon the general principle. He would not alter the laws of the land and the establishment of the Church in this particular. If any exception was made, it should be general, not specially for the Unitarians. He objected, also, to the Church being made subservient to such purposes, and to its being paid for what it was not thought fit it should perform.

The Bishop of LONDON said, at so late an hour of the night he would not take up much of their Lordships' time, but succinctly state what were the grounds upon which he would vote for this Bill going into a committee, where it might be discussed and be put into a better form. He thought the policy which had induced the Legislature to place the solemnization of marriage in the hands of the Church, was a very wise one. It contributed to that publicity which was so desirable in its celebration; and protected parties from having their ignorance or credulity practised upon by the designing and the vicious. It secured the decent and solemn performance of that which the law held to have been, in its origin, a civil more than a religious contract. —This might not be indeed a primary view of the subject, but it went to shew the wisdom of the policy which the Legislature had pursued, in conferring a certain distinction upon the Church by confiding to it the care of marriages. It was in this view of the matter that he thought no alteration ought to take place in the law, except upon very weighty reasons indeed. Now it appeared to him that general dissent from the discipline of the Church of England was not a sufficient ground for effecting such alteration. It was only when the objection attached to a particular doctrine, recognized by the service itself, that he thought the party entitled to relief. For when a person

came to Church to marry, he declared no general conformity. He was not supposed to do so. He came there to be married because he could be married nowhere else. With respect to the class in question, if there was any entire and essential difference between their tenets and any doctrine recognized in our marriage service itself, he was willing to admit that that might constitute some ground for the sort of alteration he spoke of. Their Lordships would remember, that some time since there was brought into that House a Bill which proposed to give relief to Dissenters of all denominations, who entertained opinions that differed from those of the Church of England upon particular doctrines. No sect or class was named in it. To that Bill he ventured to offer objections as to the principle; but he supported the proposition for its going into a committee. In the present instance, the case was very different. In this Bill a particular class of persons was named, and their particular scruples were defined; and their Lordships were told that while the parties felt all this difficulty as to the solemnization of marriage, they were agreed as to the necessity of offering every sort of civil security. He (the Bishop of London) could not agree with the Bishop of Chester that the parties have a right to put what interpretation they please upon the terms of the Church service. But it still did not appear to him that the Unitarian by it made any concession of his faith. If any one were to say to an Unitarian, that because he had married according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, he had therefore given up his own peculiar doctrines, and had recognized that of the Holy Trinity, the Unitarian would smile at the inference as a calumny upon him. No Unitarian, he apprehended, had ever scrupled to be married in the Church upon any such grounds. The measure before their Lordships was not one, therefore, which ought to override every consideration of civil policy; but the House ought to take sufficient security that it should not in any event be abused by individuals for the purpose of clandestine marriage, or other improper purposes; that marriages to be solemnized under it, should be solemnized with decency; and that, as far as possible, every fraud that it might be attempted to practise under colour of such an act, should be obviated. As the Bill was at present worded, it was to be observed, that banns might be falsely and unduly published, and marriage licences might be forged; and yet no parties were named as responsible, and no

punishment assigned as the penalty for such offences. The exceptions in favour of Jews and Quakers had been adverted to in the course of this discussion. He would be very willing to grant all that had been granted by the Legislature, in these respects; but their cases stood very differently in a civil point of view. As to the Jews, it allowed them an exemption from the operation of the marriage law, where both the parties were Jews. But what was it that these Dissenters asked? A similar exemption, where even one only of the parties was an Unitarian. The Jews again married according to a very ancient and established form of their religion, which was well understood: but the Dissenters prayed that parties might be married according to their religious principles. What was meant by so vague and so extensive a phrase as this? Among the Jews and Quakers, the parties were liable to be called upon for the proof of their connexion with those persuasions, in order to give validity to their marriages. Let their Lordships observe, too, what securities there existed against clandestine marriages, both among Quakers and Jews. In the case of the Jew, they were derived from his prejudices, his habits, his religion, the usages of the people, and even the authority of the Synagogue. There had once been a case decided against the validity of a Jewish marriage, by the Learned and Noble Judge (Lord Stowell) who now sat in that House, and had formerly presided with so much honour to himself and to the country in the Consistory Court of London, upon the fact only, that one of the parties was proved to have entertained opinions that were not consonant with the general religious prejudices of the Jews. The Quakers again were another class, among whom the same securities would always exist to a great degree. The members of any branch of this society coming from one part of the kingdom were obliged to produce testimonials and certificates, before they could be received or admitted into another body of the same connexion in a different portion of the empire. Without troubling their Lordships with any further detail, he believed he might say that courts of justice had never been called on to try a single case, in which the indulgence of the Legislature to the marriage of Jews or Quakers had been to be regretted. With regard to these Dissenters, (the Unitarians,) if they could give the same securities, possibly no great harm might result from extending the same indulgence to them; but no such securities could they offer, and there-

fore they asked more when they applied for the same indulgence. To be sure they proposed to maintain the formalities as to banns and registration, but they gave no security for the parties being *bonâ fide* Unitarians, nor for the character of their ministers. As to the fees to be received, that was a subject that he spoke of with some regret and doubt. It was very true, that in large towns a considerable part of the emoluments of the clergy arose from marriage fees; and he was most unwilling to take from them any portion of those fees, or any other part of their income. Still he was very unwilling to place the minister in the situation which this Bill would place him. In his view, the Church lost more by this plan in privilege than in emolument. It placed the minister in several respects, in a disagreeable predicament. At present, the gracious part of the service, that of uniting two persons attached to each other, lay with him, and that kind and pleasurable office was often remembered with gratitude through life. Under this Bill that gracious part of the office was transferred, and the minister of the Church had only to appear in the odious character of a tax-gatherer and an imposer of delays and forms. He felt therefore great difficulty in retaining that clause, at the same time that he did not like, by giving it up, to offer any sort of premium to dissent.

LORD HOLLAND observed, that the question was so plain, and so ably elucidated by the Noble President of the Council, and especially by the most Reverend Metropolitan—in such a Christian disposition, he would add, as proved that the Church of England deserved much of the credit attributed to it by a Noble Lord (Calthorpe)—that he could say but little on the question. Some objections, however, had been urged to the Bill by a Right Reverend Prelate, and by the Noble and Learned Earl on the woolsack, to which he would shortly address himself; and he did hope that the Noble and Learned Lord would not leave the House without entering a little into some explanation of the opinions he had offered to-night. And first, as to the Right Reverend Prelate (the Bishop of Chester). There was a figure of rhetoric which they had all heard used but too often in that House, and on this sort of occasion; that when a man was about to violate any important and received principle, he thought it necessary to begin by very loud and anxious praise of it, meaning in the end to violate it. Rhetoricians of this description dealt with such principles as libertines did with weak women, think-

ing that the most certain way to win them to their ruin, and to lure to destruction, was the application of extravagant praise and compliment. The Reverend Prelate had begun his speech by observing, that never was man more deeply impressed with the principles of toleration than himself. He (Lord Holland) believed him; but he was sorry to observe that the Rt. Rev. Prelate, with so much in his breast, should so seldom approve of any particular application of his general doctrine. The Rt. Rev. Prelate considered that the scruples of certain individuals were not such as ought to be respected by Noble Lords, and had entered into a detailed and ingenious argument to shew that there were no grounds for such scruples. Now really, in the first place, every man was himself the best judge of his own scruples. If a man told him that he felt them, he (Lord Holland) knew not what right he had to doubt his sincerity. The individual must be judged by his own language and actions, and not by the opinion of another, however learned the personage might be. The Right Reverend Prelate had said, that the Unitarian, in the marriage service, was not required to subscribe or repeat any thing contrary to his conscience, and that on other occasions he repeats the very words he here objects to; that is to say, he repeats them on an occasion and in a sense in which he thinks them used in scripture, in the sense which he affixes to them, and which is known and understood in his (the Unitarian's) church. But really this was a most cruel requisition. The Unitarian was to be required to repeat words to which it was avowed the priest annexed one meaning and he another. Could it be wondered at that the Unitarian objected to the repetition of words in this way? But then came the Benediction; and the Learned Prelate slipped over this very ingeniously. It does the Unitarian no good, to be sure, he said; but did it do him any harm? Good God! was this the language they were to hear, and from a prelate too? Was this the way such matters were to be disposed? Why then did he renounce the Virgin Mary and the invocation of saints? Would it be painful to him to join in such worship? And why then did he erect himself into a judge of the Unitarian's conscience? It was quite clear that such matters must be painful and revolting. "Oh! but," (said the Lord Chancellor,) "they never found it out till the Act against them was repealed." Why, he asked, had they never found out that before? Why did they never complain? The Noble and Learned Lord, in the number of years he had held his pre-

sent place, must have known of the existence of the Statute in the books; and he must know, too, that an Unitarian could not, before that Act of repeal passed, have appeared at their bar and said, "I am an Unitarian, and wish to be exempted from the operation of the Marriage Act." A public avowal of this kind would have made the party a criminal by law. "Aye," added the Noble Lord, "and are ye sure he is not so now?" And the Noble and Learned Lord expressed a wish to know what the criminal law was. Could any one tell him, if he himself did not know it? What did the Noble Earl, then, mean by this sort of ambiguous question? Why did he throw out these hints? Who was to give us the law, if he would not? And if he did not choose to do so, why did he go about thus—

"Spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas"?

Why did he suffer these persons to go away deluded by the idea that they had obtained protection? Why did he go about talking of these moral, virtuous and valuable members of society as hanging on a doubt which he could not or would not solve?—as persons who might be tried and punished, "for aught he knows"? He (Lord Holland) had been trying to conjecture what the Learned Lord could mean when he talked of this as an offence at common law. There were only two grounds; the first of which would not apply to these parties; the second (if he meant that) was so contrary to all justice, so intolerant and persecuting, that it never could for a moment be listened to. He had said, "Let us first know whether denying the Trinity be not an offence at common law." It was convenient to the Noble and Learned Lord to talk sometimes of Locke, of Hoadley and Tillotson. Let him act by those authorities. Why should he leave them on these occasions? Did he not know that Locke thought the Toleration Act defective in this very respect? for it was plain from his Correspondence with Limborch, that it was to the Unitarians he referred. Was he quite sure that Locke himself did not hold that opinion? Was he quite sure that many other great and eminent persons did not also hold it? But to return to the point:—It was a doubt, the Learned Lord said, whether these persons were not offenders at common law. And on what did this common-law doctrine of offences against religion rest? Why, on its having been said (not very happily nor reverently, as it seemed to him) that Christianity was part and parcel of the law of the land. It was Lord Hale, he believed, who first said this of

Christianity; but the doctrine was afterwards more directly and emphatically laid down by Lord Raymond. This happened in the famous case of the King and Woolston (he believed it was this case, but he had not had an opportunity of referring to it). On that occasion, the learned judge said he would not allow Christianity to be attacked, because it was, in fact, a part of the law of the land; but he begged it to be observed, that by this he meant Christianity generally, and not the tenets of any particular sect of Christians. Why then he (Lord Holland) must ask here, what was Christianity in the legal sense? Was it a belief in the Holy Scriptures—a reception of them as the rule of life, faith and conduct—or was it a belief in certain expositions of those Scriptures by human beings? He would leave the Noble and Learned Lord on the woollack to choose, in the dilemma to which he must be reduced. If the first point were held, then the Unitarians were in no sense affected by this common-law doctrine; for they held the Scriptures as sacredly as any of their Lordships. They held them to contain the rule of right, and the rule of faith, and by them alone they stood. If it were said, on the other hand, that the Christianity intended by the law was the Holy Scriptures as they were expounded by the Church, then, if the Noble and Learned Lord held that, it followed that he must be prepared to hold also, that, before the reign of Henry VIII., the Roman Catholics were the only Christians in England, (for, till that period, the Roman Catholic religion was part of the law of the land,) and that, when that King changed the sort of Christianity, he changed the common law. Another of the objections which had been raised was, that the proposed measure would make the Church of England ancillary to the Unitarian Dissenters. He did not see the force of this objection. Did the Church of Ireland consider itself in this light of a waiting-maid? He did not believe it did; yet it either registered all marriages, or left the parties to celebrate them for themselves. But it was said, that the Church was to be deprived of privileges she held by long usage. He suspected, however, that, until the passing of Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act, the Church had never exercised that right which it was contended she could not forego without derogating from her dignity. All foreign marriages, previous to that period, were celebrated according to the *lex loci*; and all marriages duly celebrated by a priest, whether of the Church of England or of Rome, were binding. As to that pathetic part of the speech of the Noble Prelate, in which he had de-

plored the hard fate of the clergymen, who by this Bill would be deprived of their fees, all he (Lord Holland) had to say in reply, was, that the Bill provided they should have their fees. But, said the Noble Prelate, those for which the Bill provided, are only the actual dues, and, beyond these dues, it is usual for parties to give a small gratuity on the solemnization of marriages, which form a considerable source of emolument to the officiating clergyman. Well, it might be so; but was it not at least likely that an Unitarian would be willing to bestow as large a gratuity when he had his marriage solemnized and registered in such a manner as should satisfy the scruple of his conscience, as when it was performed in a manner irksome and painful to his feelings? It was said too by a Noble Lord, Why should we grant this favour to Unitarians alone—why is it not to be granted to every other sect? After the answer which had been given to this by the Noble President of the Council, he (Lord Holland) would not take up the time of the House any more than by saying, because it was not *favour* they were to grant but *justice*, and because the others did not ask for it, and they, the Unitarians, did. He could not help thinking the Unitarians very hardly dealt with. If general relief was sought for them, up jumps the Noble and Learned Lord from the woolsack, and complains that it was too general. He cries out, "Who and what are you? Are you Jumpers, Shakers, Southcotians, or what, for God's sake, are you?" and fears, if the relief were given in this shape, they would not be able to make head or tail of it. Then he was in a great hurry that it should be postponed until the next session, in order that the points should be discussed one by one: but, when the next session came, the Noble and Learned Lord says, "Why do you come alone? Why do not all come?" There was no pleasing him in this way. Surely it was the plainest and best way to give relief to those who came to ask for it. If no danger should appear in doing so, he would grant it to all; but it did appear to him to be the most strange, unparliamentary and illogical reasoning that could be imagined, to say, "We won't give you the relief you ask for, because there are others who want it as much as you, and they do not ask for it." It might be a very good reason for granting the relief to all, but it could be no reason for withholding it from any. He concurred entirely in the principles and statements of the Noble and Reverend Metropolitan, and he thought it but justice to him, and to the Church of which he was an orna-

ment, to say, that he thought his objection to altering the form of the Liturgy was well founded. He (Lord Holland) would not shrink from saying that he thought certain parts of the Liturgy might be omitted; there were parts of it which, if it were in his power to make an alteration, he would willingly alter. But high as he held the principles of religious liberty, he did not think the members of one church had a right to call upon those of another to make any such omissions: that would, indeed, be making the functions of the Church ancillary to the Dissenters. But the measure proposed to the House was one purely ministerial and of a civil character. The law had made the solemnization and registration of marriages a part of the clergyman's duty, but it was no part of his ecclesiastical functions, and the Church could, therefore, be in no sense called ancillary to the objects of Dissenters. He, for one, should be for leaving out the licence, as that was the only thing which the Church was called on to grant; but there, he was afraid, the little doctrine of fees would come across them. One good-natured Prelate, too, had felt the loss of the pleasure of uniting fond couples more than of the fees, and it would perhaps therefore be well to retain the licences, that he might feel the pleasure in signing them, which he was grieving at losing in another form. The Noble Lord concluded by saying, that the Unitarians, believing as they did in the Holy Scriptures, were as much Christians as any other persons could be. If the law did hold deniers of revelation, in general, to be blasphemers (and even on that point he should be inclined to go further than many of their Lordships) and punishable, it would not affect persons who admitted that revelation as the rule of their faith. The Church admitted, and, indeed, the only distinction between Popery and Protestantism was, the right of all to judge and interpret for themselves. If Divine Revelation could, with decency or propriety, be said to be part and parcel of a code of laws, it could only be in the sense in which the Unitarians held it as well as the Church; and if their Christianity was, as the Noble and Learned Lord said, (the phrase he thought was something irreverent,) part and parcel of the law of the land, there could be no reason why this class of Christian Dissenters should be called upon to do violence to their consciences upon one of the most interesting and solemn occasions of their lives.

The Lord CHANCELLOR had no objection to repeat and explain the grounds of his doubts as to the situation of these parties at common law. The Toleration

Act exempted from its benefit the deniers of the doctrine of the Trinity. The 9 and 10 William and Mary against blasphemy and profaneness, provided certain punishment against what it called "crimes," and one of these was stated to be the denial of any of the persons of the Trinity to be God. He could not conceive that because that Act was repealed, it was not still to be evidence of what was in the acknowledgment and understanding of the Legislature, a crime antecedently punishable, though not to that extent, at common law. Mr. Justice Blackstone so treated it, and spoke of it as an offence which the Legislature found it necessary to repress by severer punishments. The question had been treated in the Courts as one of importance. It had come before himself incidentally in charity cases, and lately it had come before the Court of King's Bench, where one judge was of opinion that it was still an offence, and the other three would not say it was not. Therefore he contended they ought now to be explicit, and to require something more determinate than the phrase used by this Bill, as to "persons entertaining scruples as to the doctrine of the Trinity." What did such a phrase mean? Every body might be said to have scruples on such a subject some time or other. But if the phrase meant any thing specific, it was what the Bill seemed cautiously to avoid acknowledging, (as if the parties were aware of their situation,) namely, that they came denying the essential doctrines of the Church. He was only contending that they ought not to leave it so. As to the quotation of Locke, he could only hope that when they came to discuss the Catholic question, he should be allowed the same privilege. It had been said, that he objected first to general measures, and then to particular ones. It was enough to say he objected to this, because he was quite sure that they could never pass this Bill, and refuse any other sect who chose to apply. He considered the Bill as the greatest blow that had ever been aimed against the Church. If this Bill did not lead to many others of the same sort from every species of objectors, he would claim little credit for his power of prophecy; and then, if all sorts of Dissenters were to be let in, he defied them to retain their fees.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE said, he must contend that the Statute which repealed the exception of Unitarians from the benefit of the Toleration Act, placed them in as good situation as if that exception had never been made. What then was the state of Dissenters generally—

were they not established in fact, and protected by the State? If he found on the highest authority, that the Toleration Act took the Dissenters under the protection of the State, would it not be clear that these persons were in the same predicament? That this was the case, he found expressly decided by Mr. Justice Foster, who, as if foreseeing the very objection, used the strongest expressions, holding that this toleration was not to be treated as a connivance or exception from penalty, but that the removal of the penalty took off the idea of offence, and took the worship under the protection of the law. Could it have been the intention of the Legislature to leave the Unitarians exposed to the penalties of common law? If they were, why did not the Learned Lord state so at the time? If these persons were to remain subject to prosecution, why did he not in common candour let them know their situation, and not suffer them to be deluded by a fancied protection, when the Learned Lord knew all the time that it was a delusion? It had been said, why make the Church ancillary to these marriages? For this plain reason, that they legislated for the common advantage of the public. He had yet to learn that this was more than a civil institution, in which every member of the community had as much interest as any party before them. All that the Church was called upon to do, was, to render the duty which it performed on all other occasions, to attend to civil regulations devised for the prevention of clandestine marriages and for due registration. It was no indignity which they were offering to the Church, but a benefit they were providing for the whole community, and for the Church itself, in saving it from being made the instrument for violating conscience, with no chance of good to itself or any one, with no prospect of bringing dissidents within its pale, with no probable end but that of defeating all the kind feelings which it ought to conciliate, and substituting recollections of resentment and violated conscience, as well as dislike towards that Church which most strangely tolerated the dissident in separation from its worship at one time, and at another dragged him into a compulsive conformity on an occasion when the interests of the community call loudest for sincerity.

The House divided, when there appeared to be,

For the second reading, 21,—proxies 14
Against it, 20,—proxies 13

Majority for the Bill, 2.

LITERARY.

Royal Society of Literature.

WE looked, we confess, with some suspicion upon this Institution at its commencement; but whatever were the original views of its projectors, it is now devoted, we are willing to believe, to the encouragement and reward of literary merit. The following newspaper report justifies our good opinion:—

The Council of this Institution have elected from the class of *Honorary Associates*, the ten following individuals, to receive the allowance of £100 per ann. for life, granted by his Majesty. They take the title of *Royal Associates*:—

1. SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE, Esq.—*The Friend*, *Essays*—*Lay Sermons*—*Translation of Wallenstein*—*Remorse*, a *Tragedy*, &c.

2. The Rev. EDWARD DAVIES.—*Celtic Researches*—*Mythology of the Ancients*.

3. The Rev. JOHN JAMIESON, D. D. F. R. S. E. F. L. A. E.—*An Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*—*Hermes Scythicus*, &c.

4. The Rev. T. R. MALTHUS, M. A. F. R. S.—*Essay on Population*.

5. THOMAS JAMES MATHIAS, Esq., F. R. S. F. S. A.—*Runic Odes*—*On the Evidence relating to the Poems attributed to Rowley*—*The Shade of Alexander Pope*, &c.

6. JAMES MILLINGEN, Esq., F. S. A.—*Peintures Antiques inédites de Vases Grecs*—*Peintures de Vases Grecs de la Collection de Sir Jno. Coghill, Bart.*—*Recueil de quelques Médailles Grecques inédites*—*Medallic History of Napoleon*.

7. Sir W. OUSELEY, Knt., LL.D.—*Persian Miscellanies*—*Oriental Collections*—*Travels in Persia*, &c.

8. WM. ROSCOE, Esq.—*Life of Lorenzo de Medici*—*Life of Leo X.*, &c.

9. The Rev. HENRY JOHN TODD, M. A. F. S. A.—*The Works of Spenser*, &c.—*Milton's Poetical Works*, &c.—*Some Account of the Life and Writings of John Milton*—*Illustrations of the Lives and Writings of Gower and Chaucer*—*Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Bishop Walton*—*Johnson's Dictionary corrected*, &c.

10. SHARON TURNER, Esq., F. S. A.—*History of the Anglo-Saxons*—*Vindication of the Genuineness of the Ancient British Poems of Aneurin, Taliesin, Llywarchlen and Merddin*; to which are added, an *Essay on the Antiquity of Rhyme in Europe*—*The Voluspa*—*The History of England during the Middle Ages*—*Prolusions*.

The Milton Manuscript.

TIMES are wonderfully changed since MILTON complained of evil days and evil tongues. In the race that the Government and Parliament are running with the People in liberality, and in which they sometimes take the lead of the people, nothing that can gratify a generous cultivated mind, or do honour to the national character, seems to be overlooked. The *Milton Manuscript* (of which we gave some account, p. 124) has been recognized in Parliament, and it appears, from a conversation which we are about to give, that His Majesty has expressed his opinion of its value, and his wish for its publication! It will be our endeavour to furnish our readers with some account of it as soon as it appears.—The following is the Morning-Chronicle report of what passed in the House of Commons, Monday, March 29:—"Mr. W. WILLIAMS wished to put a question to the Right Hon. Secretary (for the Home Department). He understood that a work of the immortal Milton, in the hand-writing of one of his nephews, Philips, had been lately discovered in the State Papers. He was anxious to learn whether such a gratifying communication was true, and if true, whether it was, as he hoped, intended to give it to the public! (hear, hear!)—Mr. Secretary PEEL: It is true that a work of Milton's, in the hand-writing of Philips, has been discovered by Mr. Lemon (*Lemon*) amongst the State Papers. It is a work entitled *De Dei Cultu*, in support of the truths of the Christian Religion. *It was on its discovery submitted to His Majesty; and the first observation of His Majesty was, 'A WORK OF MILTON'S MUST BE MADE PUBLIC' (loud and continued cheers). It has since, in furtherance of the Royal decision, been submitted to a competent supervision, and the work will speedily appear*" (cheers).

NOTICES.

THE Annual Meeting of The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty will be held at Eleven precisely, of Saturday, May 15th, at the City of London Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, when a distinguished friend to Civil and Religious Freedom is expected to preside.

MR. BELSHAM is preparing for the press, An Answer to the Article in No. LIX. of the QUARTERLY REVIEW on his EXPOSITION OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

A Reply to Two Deistical Works, entitled, *The New Trial of the Witnesses, &c.*, and Gamaliel Smith's "Not Paul, but Jesus." By Ben David. 8vo. 8s.

A Letter to the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland, on the Primary Doctrine of Revealed Religion, and the Purity of the Early Irish Church. By Catholicus Verus. 8vo.

The Perennial Calendar and Companion to the Almanack, illustrating the Events of every Day in the Year, as connected with History, Chronology, Botany, Natural History, Astronomy, Popular Customs and Antiquities: with useful Rules of Health, Observations on the Weather, an Explanation of the Fast and Festivals of the Church, and other Miscellaneous useful Information. By Thomas Forster, F.L.S. M.B., &c. 8vo. 18s.

The Ministerial Character of Christ Practically Considered. By Charles R. Sumner, A.M., Domestic Chaplain to His Majesty and Prebendary of Worcester. 8vo.

A Dissertation on the Nature and Advantages of the Influence of the Holy Spirit. By William Clayton Walters, B.A. 3s. 6d.

St. Paul Vindicated: being Part the First of a Reply to "Not Paul but Jesus." By D. B. Wells, M.A., Christ College, Cambridge. 8vo. 5s.

Selections from the Works of the Baron de Humboldt, relating to the Climate, Inhabitants, Productions and Mines of Mexico; with Notes and an Introduction. By John Taylor, Esq., Treasurer to the Geological Society, &c. 8vo. Plate and Map. 12s.

Nature Displayed, on the Earth, and in the Heavens: illustrated by nearly 300 Engravings, many of them Coloured and of extra size. By Simeon Shaw, LL.D., Master of the Grammar School at Burslem, in Staffordshire. 6 vols. 8vo. 3l. 10s.

A Treatise on Navigation and Nautical Astronomy, adapted to Practice and to the Purposes of Elementary Instruction. By Edward Riddle, Master of the Mathematical School, Royal Naval Asylum, Greenwich. 8vo. 11s.

A Latin Grammar, arranged according to the Principles of the Madras Mode of Instruction, with Progressive Lessons annexed to each Rule. For the Use of the Cathedral School, Hereford. By Charles Taylor, D.D. 12mo. 3s. 6d. bound.

Elements of Modern Chemistry; comprehending the latest Discoveries which have been made in this Branch of Science. Principally designed for the Use of Students. By M. P. Orfila, Quarterly Physician to His Majesty Louis XVIII., &c. Translated from the French, by Sir John Byerley, Bart. Improved by the addition of a Copious Index and Glossary. Plates. Vol. I. 9s.

An Elementary System of Physiology. By John Bostock, M.D. F.R.S., &c. 8vo. 15s.

The History of Antient and Modern Wines. 4to. Embellishments from the Antique. 2l. 2s. Vignettes on India Paper. 3l. 3s.

The Tusculan Disputations of Cicero: Translated: A New Edition, revised and corrected, by W. H. Main. 8vo. 8s.

Lectures on the Philosophy of Modern History, delivered in the University of Dublin. By G. Miller, D.D. M.R.I.A. Vols. V. and VI. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

Naval Battles, from 1744 to the Peace of 1814; critically reviewed and illustrated. By Charles Ekins, Rear Admiral, C.B., K.W.N. 4to. 79 Plates and numerous Diagrams. 3l. 3s.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mrs. Frances Sheridan, Mother of the late Right Honourable R. B. Sheridan, and Author of "Sidney Biddulph," &c. By her Grand Daughter, Alicia Lefanu. 8vo. 12s.

Wolsey, the Cardinal, and his Times; Courtly, Political and Ecclesiastical. By George Howard. 8vo. Portrait, &c. 16s.

Memoirs of Mrs. Matilda Smith, late of Cape Town, Cape of Good Hope. By John Phillip, D.D. 8vo. 6s.

Memoirs of His Serene Highness, Anthony Philip D'Orleans, Duke of Montpensier. Written by Himself. Containing the Details of his 43 Months' Captivity in the Prisons and Forts of Marseilles. 8vo. Portrait. 9s.

Life of the Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D.D., with a Critical Examination of his Writings. By Reginald Heber, D.D., Lord Bishop of Calcutta. 2 vols. Post 8vo. Portrait. 15s.

An Historical Fragment, relative to Her late Majesty. 8vo. 4s.

The Adventures and Sufferings of John R. Jewitt, only Survivor of the Crew of the Ship Boston, during a Captivity of nearly Three Years, among the Savages of Nootka Sound. 12mo. 5s.

Memoirs of Captain Rock, the celebrated Irish Chieftain: with some Account of his Ancestors. Foolscap 8vo. 9s.

Scenes and Impressions in Egypt and in Italy. By the Author of "Recollections of the Peninsula," &c. 8vo. 12s.

Essay on the Objects of Taste. Part I. Principles.—Part II. Illustration of Principles.—Part III. Analogy with and Support from Scriptures. 12mo. 5s.

Autient Poetry and Romances of Spain. Selected and Translated by John Bowring. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Deserted City; Eva, a Tale, in 2 Cantos; and Electricity — Poems. By J. Bounden. 12mo. 6s.

The Cross and the Crescent, a Poem, in great part founded on "Mathilde." By J. Beresford, M. A., Rector of Kibworth, Leicestershire. 8vo.

Eugenia, a Poem. By Mrs. Wolferstan. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Alasco, a Tragedy, lately in Rehearsal at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, but withdrawn under the Censure of the Lord Chamberlain; the Passages suppressed by the Licensor being printed in Italics. By Martin Arthur Shee, Esq., R. A., with Notes, Preface, Remonstrance, &c. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Imaginary Conversations of Literary Men and Statesmen. By Walter Savage Landor, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 4s.

Much to Blame. A Tale. By a Celebrated Author. 3 vols. 12mo. 21s.

The Life and Adventures of David Dobbinson. Written by Himself. 12mo. 5s.

Letters of Jonathan Oldstyle, Gent. By the Author of the Sketch Book. 3s.

Fatal Errors and Fundamental Truths: illustrated in a Series of Narratives and Essays. 8vo. 9s.

No Fiction: A Letter to the Editor of the British Review, relative to that Work. By Andrew Reed. 1s. 6d.

The Periodical Press of Great Britain and Ireland: An Inquiry into the State of the Public Morals chiefly as respects their Moral and Political Influence. 12mo.

A Short Statement relative to the Bishop's Court in Ireland, and the Conduct of Tithe-Proctors in that Country. 1s.

The Marquis of Hastings' Summary of his Administration in India. 5s.

Observations on the Administration of the Poor Laws in Agricultural Districts. By C. D. Brereton, A. M., Rector of Little Massingham, Norfolk. 3s.

A Second Letter to the Right Honourable Robert Peel, on Prison Labour. With a Postscript in Reply to the Edinburgh Review. By John Headlam, M. A.,

Chairman of the Quarter Sessions at Northallerton. 2s.

A Letter to a Clergyman on the Peculiar Tenets of the Present Day. By R. Bransby Cooper, Esq., M. P. 2s.

A Comment on the Collects appointed to be used in the Church of England. By J. James, M. A. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

Matthew Henry at Hackney. To which is added, Strictures on the Unitarian Writings of the Rev. Lant Carpenter, LL.D., of Bristol. 4s. 6d.

The Aged Pilgrim's Triumph over Sin and the Grave, illustrated in a Series of Letters, never before published. By the Rev. John Newton. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

The Questionist; a Letter to John Owen, Curate of Gadsby, in Reply to his Strictures on Vaughan's Sermon, entitled "God the Doer of all Things." By E. T. Vaughan, M. A., Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester. 4s. 6d.

Remarks on Dr. Henderson's Appeal to the Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society, on the Subject of the Turkish New Testament. By Professor Lee, of Cambridge. 8vo.

Horæ Privatae; or, Meditations, Prayers and Reflections. By J. Still, LL.B. Post 8vo. 8s.

The School Boy's Manual and Young Man's Monitor; being a Collection of Scriptural Extracts, and other Moral and Prudential Maxims. 2s.

A Few Words respecting the Probability of a Revelation of the Nature and Will of the Deity; and the Probability and Truth of the Mosaic and Christian Revelations. 1s.

A Letter to Sir E. Knatchbull, Bart. M. P., in Reply to a Letter by the Rev. G. R. Gleig, A. M. By S. Rickards, A. M., one of the Secretaries of the Church Missionary Association for the County of Kent. 2s.

The Anti-Swedenborg. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

A Concise View of the Scriptures, shewing their Consistencies and their Necessity, from an Examination of the Extent of Natural Knowledge. 8vo. 6s.

Baptism.

Infants' Church-Membership and Baptism most clearly proved to be God's Ordinance from Plain Testimony of Holy Scripture. First printed in 1728. 6d.

On Baptism; chiefly in Reply to the Etymological Positions of the Rev. Greville Ewing; the Polemic Discussions of the Rev. Timothy Dwight, LL.D.; and the Inferential Reasonings of the Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D. D. By F. A. Cox, A. M. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Baptism the Scriptural and Indispensable Qualification for Communion at the Lord's Table: including Animadversions on the "Preface," &c., of the

Rev. R. Hall's Reply to the Rev. J. King-horne's Work on "Baptism a Term of Communion." By Joseph Ivimey. 3s.

Reply to H. F. Burder on Baptism. By Isaiah Birt. 2nd ed. with Additions. 1s. 6d.

An Essay on Baptism; being an Inquiry into the Meaning, Form and Extent of the Ordinance. By Greville Ewing. 2nd edit. enlarged.

Negro Slavery.

Correspondence between George Hibbert, Esq., and the Rev. T. Cooper, relative to the Condition of the Negro Slaves in Jamaica, Extracted from the Morning Chronicle: also, A Libel on the Character of Mr. and Mrs. Cooper, published, in 1823, in several of the Jamaica Journals; with Notes and Remarks. By Thomas Cooper. 8vo. 2s.

Speech of the Right Honourable George Canning, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on Ameliorating the Condition of the Negro Slaves in the West Indies. (By Authority.) 2s. 6d.

Negro Emancipation and West Indian Independence, the true Interest of Great Britain. By John Taylor. 1s.

The Whole of the very Lengthened Proceedings of Twenty-Eight Days' Trial of the Court Martial on Mr. John Smith, of Demerara; with an Appendix, containing the Affidavit of Mrs. Smith. (Copied verbatim from the Minutes of Evidence, ordered to be printed by the House of Commons.) 8vo. 14s.

The Question of the Gradual Abolition of Slavery in the West Indies examined on General Principles of Justice and Expediency. 2s.

A Letter to William Wilberforce, Esq., M. P., on the Subject of Slave-Emancipation. By an Eye-Witness. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Sermons.

On the Study of the Bible, and on the Doctrines of Christianity as taught by our Lord Jesus Christ; with an Appendix. By William Bruce, D. D., Senior

Minister of the First Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Apostolical Preaching and Vindication of the Gospel, addressed to the Jews, Samaritans and Devout Gentiles, considered in 20 Discourses, delivered at the Hulsean Lecture for 1823. By James Clarke Franks, M. A. 8vo. 12s.

On the Principal Events and Truths of Redemption. With an Address and Dissertation on the State of the Departed and the Descent of Christ into Hell. By J. H. Hobart, D. D., Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the State of New York. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 1s.

Parochial. By J. Still, LL.B., Rector of Fonthill Gifford, &c. Post 8vo. 8s.

Practical. By the late Rev. Joseph Milner, M. A., Vicar of the Holy Trinity Church, Hull. Vol. III. 8vo. 12s.

The Duties of Protestants and Roman Catholics towards each other, in 2 Discourses, delivered in the Scots Church in Mary's Abbey, Dublin. By James Carlile. 2s.

Single.

On the Duty of Family Prayer: preached in the Church of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, Feb. 22, 1824. By C. J. Blomfield, D. D., Rector. 1s.

Preached in St. Mary-le-bone Church, March 11, 1824, being the Day after the Funeral of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Titchfield. By Edward Serocold Pearce, M. A. F. S. A. 8vo. 1s.

Preached for the Benefit of the London Orphan Asylum, at St. Dunstan's in the East, Feb. 15, 1824. By R. Lynam, A. M. 1s.

Divine Grace the Source of all Human Excellence: occasioned by the Death of the Rev. W. Ward, March 7, 1823, preached at Serampore. By J. Marshman, D. D. 1s. 6d.

Preached at the Monthly Lecture, Feb. 12, 1824, at the Rev. T. Roberts's Meeting-House, King Street, Bristol. By William Thorpe. 2s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. Turner; and Jevans; and from A Friend to Free Inquiry.

Mr. Jevans will oblige us by furnishing another copy of his paper.

We have heard with concern of the death of the Rev. PENDLEBURY HOUGHTON, late of Liverpool, and hope to receive an obituary memoir of him.

Subscribers or others having duplicates of No. 133, of the Monthly Repository, containing the Memoir of the late Rev. W. Vidler, may have other Numbers in exchange, or the value in money, for that Number, with or without the Portrait, on application to the Publishers or the Printer.